



Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

SCC
2535

Green Fund

1879

Division.....

Section

Shelf.....

Number.. **Reserve Storage**

Religion.

	£	s.	d.
A Translation of Dr. Paul Henry's Life and Times of Calvin. From the German, by the Rev. H. Stebbing, D.D., F.R.S., &c. 2 vols. 8vo. (In the press.)			
Anthologia Sacra ; or, Select Theological Extracts on subjects Doctrinal, Practical, and Experimental. Royal 8vo, cloth,	1	4	0
Bannister's (J. T.) Survey of the Holy Land: its Geography, History, and Destiny, &c., with an Introduction, by the Rev. Dr. Marsh. Demy 8vo, cloth,	0	14	0
Barrow's Christian Class Book, or School Bible. 12mo, bound.	0	6	0
Questions to ditto. To be filled up in Writing by the Pupil. In thick post copy-book,	0	2	0
Key to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	0	9
Barrow's Questions on the New Testament. 18mo, sewed,	0	1	0
Ditto. To be filled up in Writing by the Pupil. In thick post copy-book,	0	2	0
Key to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	0	9
Barrow's Questions on the Old Testament. 18mo, sewed,	0	1	0
Ditto. To be filled up in Writing by the Pupil. In thick post copy-book,	0	2	0
Key to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	0	9
Bateman's "The Bible the Word of God." 12mo, cloth,	0	4	0
Baxter's Key for Catholics to open the Juggling of the Jesuits, &c. 8vo, cloth,	0	12	0
Beausobre's Introduction to the Reading of the Holy Scriptures. 12mo, boards,	0	7	0
Blair's Sermons. 1 vol. 8vo, cloth,	0	10	6
Buck's Anecdotes, Religious, Moral, and Entertaining. 12mo, cloth, lettered,	0	5	0
Bushby's Introduction to the Study of the Scriptures. 12mo, sewed,	0	3	6
Butler's Treatise on the Analogy of Religion to the Constitution and Course of Nature. By Dr. Bushby. 8vo, boards,	0	6	0
Ditto. Preface by Dr. Halifax. 12mo,	0	4	0
Crossman's Introduction to the Knowledge of the Christian Religion. 18mo, sheep,	0	1	0
Dobell's Selection of more than Eight Hundred Evangelical Hymns. 18mo, bound,	0	5	6

Religion,

(Continued.)

£ s. d.

Doddridge's Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul. Fcp. 8vo, cloth,	0	3	6
Evans' Sketch of the Various Denominations of the Christian World. 12mo, cloth,	0	5	0
Fulton and Knight's Vocabulary of Scripture Names. Square 12mo, sewed,	0	0	6
Greenly's Practical Sermons for every Sunday in the Year. Fifth Edition. 2 vols. 12mo, cloth, each,	0	6	0
Horne's (Bishop) Commentary on the Book of Psalms. New Edition. 8vo, boards,	0	10	6
Horne's (Bishop) Discourses. 2 vols. 8vo, boards,	0	18	0
Leslie's Select Works. 8vo, boards,	0	10	6
Nightingale's Religions, and Religious Ceremonies of all Nations. Tenth Edition. 12mo, bound,	0	10	6
Paley's Evidences of Christianity. New Edition. 8vo, boards,	0	5	0
Ditto. With Analysis by Fisk. 12mo, boards,	0	5	6
Paley's Natural Theology; or, Evidences of the Exist- ence and Attributes of the Deity. Third Edition. 2 vols. 8vo, boards,	1	4	0
Paley's Works and Life. By his Son. 4 vols. 8vo, boards,	1	16	0
Psalms of David Metrically Paraphrased. 12mo, cloth,	0	3	6
Robinson's Theological Dictionary. 8vo, cloth,	1	8	0
Rogers' Help to Family and Private Devotion, con- taining Fifty-six Prayers. 12mo, cloth,	0	4	0
Carlyon's Scripture Notices and Proofs, chiefly drawn from the Writings of Eminent Divines. 8vo, cloth,	0	10	6
Sale's Koran; commonly called the Alcoran of Mo- hammed. With Explanatory Notes, &c. 2 vols. 8vo, boards,	1	4	0
Scripture References and Sacred Poetry arranged under various heads. 12mo, cloth,	0	5	0
Ditto. Silk or roan, each,	0	6	6
Secker's (Archbishop) Works. With Life and Cha- racter by Bishop Porteus. 6 vols. 8vo, cloth,	2	14	0
Sellon's (The Rev. M.) Abridgment of the Holy Scriptures. 18mo, half-bound,	0	1	6
Stonhouse's Sick Man's Friend. 12mo, cloth,	0	4	6

Religion,

(Continued.)

	£	s.	d.
Thirty Village Sermons; several original, and the remainder selected from approved Evangelical Authors. 12mo, sewed, 3s. cloth,	0	3	6
Usher's (Archbishop) Complete Works. Vol. 2 to 13. 8vo, cloth, each,	0	12	0
Watts's Short View of Scripture History. 12mo, bound,	0	3	6
Wheatley's Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England. New Edition. 8vo, bds.,	0	8	0
Wilson's Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England. 8vo, cloth,	0	7	0
Whittaker's Improved Editions of Pinnock's Catechisms			
Religion			
Evidences of Christianity			
Liturgy of the Church of England			
Natural Theology			
Religious Denominations			
Scripture History, Sewed, each,	0	0	9
Church Catechism.	0	0	3
Church Collects	0	0	6
Church Collects and Catechism. Church Collects, with Notes. Each,	0	0	6
Whittaker's Improved Edition of Pinnock's Compendious History of the Bible. 12mo, bound,	0	3	0

Biography, &c.

British Biography.—Biographies of the most Eminent

Men of our own Country, from Chancer to Telford; including Legislators, Philosophers, Poets, Warriors, and Men of Science, to whom Public Monuments have been raised in St. Paul's and Westminster Abbey. To which are added, the Inscriptions and Translations of the Latin Epitaphs, a History of the Cathedrals, and an Appendix of all the Dignitaries, &c. By George Lewis Smyth, Esq. Comprising upwards of 400 pages, large 8vo, (equal to 1600 pages, common type, demy 8vo,) cloth,

Sold separately. St. Paul's, 3s. 6d. Westminster Abbey, 7s. 6d. sd.

Bell's Life of Mary Queen of Scots. Large 8vo, 0 3 6

Carrick's Life of Sir William Wallace, of Elderslie; with the History of his Struggle for the Independence of Scotland. New Edition. Large 8vo, 0 3 0

Dodd's Peerage, Baronetage, Knightage, and Titled Classes of Great Britain and Ireland. Alphabetically arranged, and containing, in addition to the usual contents of a Peerage, the Junior Branches of the Nobility, Knights, Bishops, Judges, Privy Counsellors, &c. By C. R. Dodd, Esq., Author of "The Parliamentary Pocket Companion," &c. 12mo, cloth, 0 9 0

Dodd's Parliamentary Companion, containing a full Biographical Dictionary of both Houses, a Statement of the Polls, Population, &c., with Explanations of Parliamentary Terms and Proceedings. Royal 32mo, morocco gilt, 0 4 6

Gorton's General Biographical Dictionary. 3 vols. 8vo, cloth, lettered, 2 2 0

Biography, &c. *(Continued.)*

	£	s.	d.
Jones's New Biographical Dictionary. Eighth Edition, 18mo, bound,	0	6	0
Life and Times of John Reuchlin, or Capnion (Father of the German Reformation). By Francis Barham. 12mo, cloth,	0	5	0
Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola, illustrating the Progress of the Reformation in Italy during the Fifteenth Century. 12mo, cloth, lettered,	0	6	6
Tablet of Memory, or Mirror of Chronology, &c. 12mo, cloth,	0	6	6
Todd's Life and Writings of Milton, derived principally from Documents in Her Majesty's State Paper Office. 8vo, boards,	0	10	6
Watkins' Scripture Biography. 12mo, bound,	0	7	0

Natural Philosophy, &c.

Arago's (M.) Popular Lectures on Astronomy, illustrated by numerous Wood-cuts. Third Edition. Large 8vo, sewed,	0	2	0
Blair's Practical Grammar of the Elements of Natural Philosophy. 18mo, bound,	0	6	6
Questions to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	1	0
Ditto. To be filled up in Writing by the Pupil. In thick post copy-book,	0	2	0
Key to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	0	9
Blair's Universal Preceptor, or General Grammar of Arts, Sciences, and Useful Knowledge. 18mo, bound,	0	5	0
Questions to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	1	0
Ditto. To be filled up in Writing by the Pupil. In thick post copy-book,	0	2	0
Key to ditto. 18mo, sewed,	0	0	9
Brinkley's Elements of Astronomy. 8vo, cloth,	0	12	0
Clarke's Wonders of the Heavens. 12mo, bound,	0	10	6
Comstock's System of Natural Philosophy, in which the Elements of that Science are familiarly explained and adapted to the comprehension of Young Persons, with appropriate Questions on each page for the examination of Scholars, with 224 Illustrations. Carefully revised, with additions on the Air Pump, Steam Engine, &c. By George Lees, A.M., Lecturer on Natural Philosophy, Edinburgh. 4th Edition. 18mo, bound,	0	4	6
N.B. Care should be taken to order "LEES' COMSTOCK," as the book hitherto used in Medical Schools, &c.			
Denison's (J.) New Theory of Gravitation. 8vo, cloth,	0	3	6
Griffin's Treatise on Optics. 8vo, boards,	0	8	0

THE
COMMISSION AND CONSEQUENT DUTIES
OF THE
CLERGY.

L O N D O N :
GILBERT & RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

Henry George Piers

THE COMMISSION AND CONSEQUENT DUTIES
OF THE CLERGY:

IN A

SERIES OF DISCOURSES

PREACHED BEFORE THE

University of Cambridge,

IN APRIL, MDCCCXXVI.

BY THE LATE

Senior
Wrangler
1847
HUGH JAMES ROSE, B.D.

CHRISTIAN ADVOCATE, AND DEAN OF DOCKING.

' They do not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission and authority.'—ART. xxvi

' The ministry of things divine is a function which, as God did himself institute, so neither may men undertake the same but by authority and power given them in lawful manner.'—HOOKER, v. 77.

' A call then is necessary; and this call, though mediate, and by the ministry of men, is from Christ.'—BISHOP REYNOLDS, SERMON xxiii. Works, Vol. v. p. 352.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1847.

‘Nec prærogativam mihi met scientiæ, si hæc meis consacerdotibus charitatis intuitu prærogem, vindicabo, aut vitæ perfectæ me esse fatcor, cum de vita perfecta alios moneo, sed potius cum hæc ad illos loqui audeo, simul cum illis, quæ loquor, audiam.’—

PSEUDO-AMBROS. DE DIGNIT. SACERD. L. 1. ad finem.

TO THE
REV. WILLIAM ROSE,
VICAR OF GLYNDE, SUSSEX,
THE FOLLOWING SERMONS
ARE
AFFECTIONATELY INSCRIBED.



ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

FIRST EDITION.

It is recorded by Strype¹, that in the reign of King James I. the disposition to treat of Church discipline in Sermons was so strong and so general, that it was at length publicly censured in the University pulpit². So constant a recurrence to the topic must have been highly mischievous in those days, as it kept alive the flame of controversy, which it was then particularly desirable to extinguish ; and it is objectionable at all times, as it excludes those higher subjects of Christian faith and practice which are the proper topics of the Christian preacher. In the present

¹ Annals, Vol. III. p. 491.

² By a Mr. Greenham, 'a zealous preacher,' according to Strype.

day we have gone into the opposite extreme, and Church discipline is a matter rarely or never mentioned in the pulpit¹. There can

¹ ‘What from the loose writing of some of the Clergy, and the general silence of the body, upon the constitution of the Christian Church, the subject is so grown out of knowledge, as to have lost almost universally its influence upon the mind. Ask an ignorant man, why he separates from the Church, his answer will probably be, that he lives in a land of liberty, where he has a *right* to worship God in the way he thinks proper. Ask a man of reading and understanding, and he will quote respectable authority for the same opinion; whereas, both one and the other might, it is probable, have continued members of the Church, had they been taught to form a correct notion of it. But when they have been led to consider the *Church*, as a word of general and indiscriminate application, and religion itself as a subject of mere private opinion, independent of all authority, it is not to be expected that they should feel disposed to restrain a licence, of which, from the latitudinarian way of thinking and acting in which they have been educated, they conceive themselves born in rightful possession.

‘The minister of the Church, however, who prays constantly against *schism*, should in consequence think it his duty to prevent Christians, as far as may be, from falling into so dangerous a sin. And whilst he remembers of what spirit a Christian ought to be, the means made use of by him for the purpose will be no other than what a Christian ought to employ. “Following (to make use of the words of the celebrated Mr. Locke) the example of the *Prince of Peace*, who sent out his soldiers to the subduing of nations and gathering them into his Church,

be no question that of the two our course is the wisest ; yet it would be advisable in this,

not armed with the sword, or other instruments of force, but accoutred in that best armour, *the Gospel of Peace*, and the *exemplary* holiness of Christian conversation."

' Without pronouncing sentence, therefore, upon, or disturbing, those who are without the Church, his object will be to preserve those that still remain in it. This he will do by enabling them to form correct notions of the nature and constitution of the Christian Church : and by giving them such an explanation from time to time of its services, as may produce in them a rational attachment for its communion. Considering the Church as a society which has God for its founder, and Christian faith as the offspring of Divine revelation, he will regard the varying opinions of mankind upon those subjects rather as proofs of the weakness and incapacity of the human mind, than as illustrations of the truth. At the same time, therefore, that he is desirous of laying no unnecessary restraint upon human judgment in religious subjects, he will take care to point out the standard by which it should be regulated ; a standard which draws the line between faith and credulity ; between a sober inquiry after truth, accompanied with a proper respect for authority ; and that licentiousness of opinion which knows no authority but its own ; in a word, between that liberty with which Christ has made us free, and the liberty which the natural man is at all times disposed to make for himself. But the Clergy, some individuals of the body at least, have still more to answer for on this subject. A freedom of opinion on Church matters has led, as it might be expected, to a freedom of practice : while some, by their writings, have put the establishment of the Church, as it were, quite out of sight ; others, by their conduct, have openly withdrawn

as in other matters, to avoid either extreme. The subject of discipline will be allowed by every one who knows the history of Protestantism, and by every one who is well acquainted with the human mind, to deserve more attention than it obtains. The importance of *forms* will be at once acknowledged by both classes of observers ; but, to waive that topic, we may say with certainty that many unhappy differences would never have arisen ; much schism, and much that is unseemly in the conduct of the inferior clergy to their superiors, and to one another, would have been avoided, if this subject had always

Christians from it, by becoming, in some cases, officiating ministers in places of public worship independent of Episcopal jurisdiction : in others, by their attendance at places of worship which are in an actual state of separation from the Church of their country. How such conduct agrees with the established government of the Church ; how the circumstance of a minister of the Church taking upon himself to preach in a place of worship unlicensed by the bishop, is to be reconciled with canonical obligation ; with what propriety such a minister can, in the Liturgy of the Church, pray against *schism* in that place where he is in the actual commission of the sin ; are points upon which I feel myself at a loss to determine.'—See Daubeny's Guide to the Church, pp. 341—344.

obtained due consideration in clerical studies. And on yet higher grounds may full attention be claimed for that especial point which is treated in the following Discourses. If we are really ambassadors for Christ, and have a due commission from his Church, it were well that a remembrance of these truths were deeply imprinted on our hearts ; well, I mean, for the Church, that we may not despise that authority to which we owe our own ; well for those to whom we are sent, that we may not be slack in delivering our message ; well for ourselves, that being the appointed servants of a Master, who, to the worldly eye, may seem to gather where he hath not strewn, we may not be found sleeping when he comes to account with us.

It was under a deep sense of the importance of the subject that I ventured to introduce it to those among my audience who were about to become ministers of the Church of Christ. It was also, I can say sincerely, with unfeigned humility. I had no hope of doing justice to the subject, but I thought it

might be useful to the persons to whom I allude, to direct their attention to it. I need hardly add, that these Sermons make no pretence to novelty of matter or of argument: they only endeavour to set forth briefly and clearly the propositions which will be found in the works of all our early and great Church writers. To these writers, they who wish to enter more fully into the subject must recur: and I trust that I have sufficiently pointed out in the Notes the best sources of information.

I must add, that I had no intention whatever of *publishing* Sermons on a subject so often treated in former times; and that I now do so only in consequence of very many requests from that part of my audience to which they were especially addressed. Their requests would have obtained far earlier attention had I not been prevented, by other engagements, from preparing the Notes now subjoined to the Sermons.

HORSHAM, SUSSEX,

May 19, 1828.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO THE

SECOND EDITION.

THE call for a Second Edition of this Work has given me an opportunity of presenting it in a form which, I trust, may be somewhat more convenient to the reader, and of adding such remarks and extracts as appear to me to deserve attention.

Without adverting to any personal feelings, I may be allowed to express my gratification that there should be a demand for a second edition of a work which seeks to maintain the old-fashioned opinions avowed in the following pages. It serves to confirm me in the belief, that as the opposite opinions are more loudly and clamorously repeated, they are also more carefully examined, and their consequences more fully seen. The contempt of order, the

contempt of forms, the contempt of discipline, are feelings well adapted to prompt and dictate declamation, and to dazzle and delude both those who utter and those who listen to them; but, if there is any wisdom to be learned from history, and if the voice of experience deserves any attention, they cannot be reduced to practice without imminent danger. The ‘little learning’ which makes men despise what they do not understand, must finally, (though, perhaps, not till it has ruined what it cannot repair,) give place to that more benevolent wisdom which, as it seeks to promote God’s will by promoting man’s good, despises not, and knows that it ought not to despise, any rightful means by which that end can be promoted.

The ‘little learning’ has been for a long time straining its powers, and uttering its outcry among us, in a thousand quarters, and has done, beyond all question, more extensive mischief than its powers account for or justify, by teaching men to mistake indifference to error for charity, and to set aside the guidance

and the direction recommended by wisdom (I maintain, by *Divine* wisdom,) for human weakness. The mischief, however, will, I know, at last be perceived, and the temper, from which it proceeds, will sink into the contempt it merits. I trust it may not be too late in some essential respects.

I may, perhaps, be excused, if I venture to add a few words as to a temper of not a very different kind, which has manifested itself in various forms in our Church within a recent period. I allude to the cry for Church reform, (I do not mean in temporal matters, of which this is not the place to speak, but) in the more important points of Liturgy, discipline, &c. &c. It is difficult to witness this temper display itself as it has done, without deep regret and considerable apprehension. I must confess, at least, my own conviction that, where there is an order for the especial purpose of guiding; directing, and correcting, it would, to say the least, be more seemly for the inferior Clergy to wait till they were called to council, before they were forward to detect, discover,

or invent faults in the Establishment of which they are a part. It is difficult to understand how we can pray for a blessing on any system as a means of doing God's work, if, as often as our own humours or fancies lead us to suppose that the system stands in our way, we are ready to set it aside. I am far from saying that in consultations on Church matters the Presbyters should not be called to council, or that their counsel would not be of the highest moment. But if we believe that the system of which we are a part is laid on the foundation of the Apostles, nay, even on lower grounds, if we believe it to be the best in a human view, and if we know that under that system it is the part of the bishops to rule the Church, and of the Presbyters to obey them, it is not and it cannot come to good that the Presbyters should forget that there are rulers in the Church, and should unhesitatingly spread far and wide their own uncalled-for fancies as to the proper method of governing and improving the Church. The Church, doubtless, like every human institution, has its imperfections, and every affectionate son

of the Church will rejoice to see them amended by the proper hands, at a proper time, and in a proper spirit. Very probably the rulers of the Church may not alter the system either when, or as, some Presbyters might choose : but this is no proof that the rulers are wrong ; nor would it be any reason why the system should be set aside, even if they were. For this would be only the common case of deciding between a system and no system ; between a system with the evils and imperfections which must attach to every thing human, and the evils of adhering to no system at all, and of being guided by the caprice of the hour and ‘ the madness of the people !’

But, besides this, it must surely be a matter of deep concern that Ministers of the Church of England should have thought it right to speak so harshly and so loudly on matters, most of which are of trivial moment, and should thus give to them who are without (I say not only the fairest grounds, but) the strongest reason for believing that the system must be

corrupt and bad indeed¹. I do not for a moment doubt the goodness of the intentions of many who have written on these topics, but I would beg to ask whether the many pamphlets which discuss them are remarkable for those qualities which ought to distinguish the works of persons undertaking the momentous business of Church reform? I would ask whether the points which have been dwelt upon with such earnestness are of much real moment? and whether it is fitting that complaints so vehement should be made, that we might suppose the Church to be in a frightful state of corruption and error, whereas the evils complained of are, in truth, such as these—that we pray for the king by one title rather than another, that we use too charitable an expression in the burial-service, and repeat the Lord's prayer three times instead of two, or four instead of three? It is hard to listen when, instead of being awe-struck at the

¹ I would beg to refer to the many tracts lately written by Dissenters, in which the works of Messrs. Nihil, Acaster, Ryland, &c. &c. are cited at great length, in proof of the faults of the Church.

grandeur, the sublimity, the magnificence, the solemnity of some vast cathedral, our companion begs us to observe that one of the mullions of one of the windows is the hundredth part of an inch out of the perpendicular; or when, instead of owning and admiring the wonders of the composition, he sets about showing the meanness of the component parts. It is hard to tolerate the perpetual picking of small holes, or to admire the microscopic powers of the eye, which can discern the insects in the drop of water, while it is stone-blind to the giant form of the elephant.

It is a matter of sincere pride and pleasure to me to find these sentiments expressed with far greater power and force than I can command, by one in whom the most deep and intimate knowledge of the history and constitution of the Church of England is united with the most affectionate reverence for her institutions, and the most uncompromising attachment to her principles. I earnestly hope that Dr. Wordsworth's admirable *Concio ad Clerum*, delivered before Convocation this

year, will be as generally read, and make as deep an impression, as its excellence in every point of view deserves that it should ; and I only regret that I do not feel myself at liberty to strengthen my argument by a larger extract than that which follows :

‘ Plurimi igitur nuperrime litteratores extiterunt, et, quod dolens pudensque dico, ii haud minima de parte ex nobismet ipsis prodeuntes, ex ipso nempe Cleri Anglicani cœtu, qui adeo non ἐν σοφίᾳ περιπατοῦντες πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω, adeo non ἀναγκάζοντες εἰσελθεῖν, ut potius ingredi jam paratos prohibuisse videantur, non mente, fateor, destinata atque consulto, sed facto atque eventu tamen ; hi, inquam, novandi studio perciti in hanc tanquam pulcherrimam occasionem videntur devolâsse, veterem formam Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ ritusque sanctissimos certatim vexandi atque laccessendi ; Matris suæ auctoritatem atque reverentiam ea, credo, ratione externis hominibus probaturi, si eam ipsam auctoritatem sibimetipsis displicere non obscuro indicio patefecissent. Quid autem novi ab his in medium allatum adductumque videmus ?

quid exquisiti aut reconditi? quid denique singulari quavis modestia, eruditione, sapientia, prudentia commendatum? Imo vero nihil fere omnino quod non tritissimum sit, et plane vulgaris monetæ; quam plurima autem quorum Hookeros nostros, Sandersonos, Pearsonos, viros omni laude cumulatissimos, maximopere piguisset. Scilicet istis visum est exoletissimas quasque Puritanorum et Schismaticorum querelas——quasi de integro in acervum congerere, et coram levi plebecula ambitiose venditare. Equidem commoveor animo cum conspiciam—non iis renovandi Ecclesiam atque corroborandi munus esse demandatum, qui vel loco, vel auctoritate, vel opportunitate illud optime videantur administraturi; sed arreptum potius et sibi arrogatum ab Ecclesiastici ordinis hominibus neque primaria Ecclesiæ dignitate, neque eruditionis copia, neque antiquitatis scientia, neque prudentia denique et gravitate spectatissimis, et eo præsertim tempore arrogatum, quum sana corrumpere longe proclivius sit, quam corrupta emendare.’

I would beg to observe, in conclusion, that I

have thrown the longer notes into an Appendix, and that the student in divinity will now find, either in the body of the work, or in the Appendix, some proof of the following points,—that a ministry is expedient—that a ministry was ordained by God ¹—that Episcopacy is the form ordained—that the succession of bishops has been duly preserved in the Church of England—that the minor details of Church government have been left to human wisdom—and that a Confession of faith is a most important article among those details.

In speaking of Episcopacy, I have used the arguments of Chillingworth, and a modern Layman, Mr. Hey of Leeds, both on account of the intrinsic excellence of their reasoning, and from the wish to show what can be urged on this important topic, by a Divine, who was no high-churchman, and by a Layman.

¹ I beg to refer to some judicious remarks on this point by my brother, in his translation of *Neander*.

HADLEIGH, SUFFOLK,

Sept. 26, 1831.

PREFATORY NOTICE

TO THE

THIRD EDITION.

MORE delay than was anticipated having taken place in preparing for the press a selected arrangement of the works of the late lamented Principal of King's College, to be accompanied with some biographical and other particulars, with the addition of a few unpublished MSS., it has been thought advisable to comply with a constantly recurring demand for the particular work now reprinted, in advance of the more extended publication in hand. This second course of University Sermons is of such value to Candidates for Holy Orders in particular, that over and above any possible convenience of obtaining it in a separate and

cheaper form, it does not seem right to leave it inaccessible to any, even for a short time.

With respect to the many friends and others who revere the memory and services of HUGH JAMES ROSE on wider grounds, it is conceived they cannot but feel regret that, from a desultory manner of publication to meet immediate circumstances, his more important works should exist as yet only in detached forms, ill proportioned to their intrinsic weight and excellence. It is proposed, accordingly, to remedy this defect by the forthcoming selection, to be presented in the more solid and appropriate shape of (probably) three uniform octavo volumes. The choice of published and unpublished writings, as well as of memorial details, will be regulated by a careful consideration of what the Author himself might have been most desirous, so far as can be judged, of perpetuating in such more substantial form, as contradistinguished from the chances of official or temporary publications. The selection, as at present intended, will include only writings of a theological or eccle-

siastical complexion, except so far as miscellaneous topics may occur in any correspondence interwoven with the Biographical Memoirs.

It will be the Editor's anxious endeavour to complete the publication in course of the ensuing year, 1843.

J. M.

November 30, 1842.

CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

PAGE

- On the probability that a commission would be given to the
Ministry 1

See foot notes.

SERMON II.

- On the proofs from Scripture that such a commission was given . . 38

SERMON III.

- On the obligation resting on those who have received such com-
mission to make themselves competent to its exercise . . . 85

SERMON IV.

- On the duties incumbent on those who have received such com-
mission 135

APPENDIX.

No. I.

- Expediency of a Church government—Analysis of Bishop Rey-
nolds' Twenty-fifth Sermon, and Dr. Balguy's two Conse-
cration Sermons 175

No. II.

PAGE

Proof of the calling of the Apostles, in reply to Schleiermacher . 183

No. III.

Remarks on the permanency of the Episcopal order 188

No. IV.

Chillingworth on Episcopacy 196

No. V.

Hey on Episcopacy 201

No. VI.

Validity of the Episcopacy of the Church of England 226

No. VII.

Observations on details in Church government 251

No. VIII.

Necessity of learning to the Ministry—Opinions of great writers
on the point 258

No. IX.

Advantages of a confession of faith 267

SERMON I.

1 COR. iv. 1.

*Let a man so account of us, as of the Ministers of Christ, and
Stewards of the mysteries of God.*

IN the consideration of Christianity as a Religion for mankind, there is a certain point up to which its friends and its enemies can advance with an almost perfect agreement of sentiment. In the moral teaching of our Lord and his Apostles there is such a clear and triumphant superiority over every other system ever proposed to the world, that the voice of praise, which has ever been uttered by the advocates of Christianity, has been on this point re-echoed with almost equal warmth and zeal by at least the great majority of its adversaries. The declared unbeliever, indeed, could hope for little attention to his arguments, if he set out with denying a truth of which all are capable of judging. And they, who, though not in declared hostility to Christianity, are actuated by a spirit

wholly unchristian, the men of this world, the representatives of the spirit of ambition, of pleasure, and of commerce, are alive to the advantages which must accrue to them from the prevalence of the Christian principles of guilelessness and forbearance among those with whom they are to engage in the business of life. But when we advance from this ground, and speak of Christianity as a call of the Spirit, as containing within itself remedies for vice and assistances to virtue, of a higher order than the fears or the motives which morality can urge, we speak to them who hear not, who cannot or will not understand.

It is, in truth, the fatal error of man to tend perpetually to an exclusive subsistence in one part of that twofold nature with which he is endowed; sometimes to resign the practical for the speculative, but far oftener to sink the spiritual and intellectual in the earthly and carnal, to own no participation in the higher part of his nature, to resign its privileges, and forget its requirements. In this state, the nutriment offered to one part of his nature, is neither adapted to the other, nor can be apprehended by it. For this is that fatal condition of which the Apostle speaks, declaring a truth no less in the philosophy of human nature than in pure religion, when he says that ‘the carnal man discerneth not the things of the Spirit, because they

are spiritually discerned.' We may, indeed, assume it as a fact established by every day's experience, that there is a veil on the hearts of worldly men with respect to spiritual objects¹, and especially in relation to some of the leading and characteristic truths of Christianity.

I refer not here to the doctrine of the corruption of our nature, nor the revelation of a future state of existence, being persuaded that both of these may be admitted by a heart wholly unspiritual; the latter being not indeed a truth, but a probability, of natural religion, and the former, a difficulty brought so irresistibly to the notice of all men and all ages, by the incontrovertible evidence of experience, as to have obtained attention and caused perplexity in the earliest systems of religion and morals. I refer now to the mysteries of that redemption which is our faith and our religion, the agent in which was the Divine Jesus, and the effects of which are to us sanctification from sin here, and liberation from its penal effects hereafter; and I refer especially to the means and processes of human sanctification by the Holy Spirit.

That amendment and elevation of heart and character should be obtained, not by any power

¹ On this subject, see Jeremy Taylor's admirable sermon called *Via Intelligentiæ*, Vol. vi. p. 366 and following, in Heber's edition, and especially pp. 379—387.

dwelling by nature within the individual ; that it should be gained, not by the operation of the ordinary motives of morality, not by the vaunted power of favourable habits ; or, to speak the whole at once, that there should be a constant communion between this earthly world and a higher, between this earthly and visible creature and that heavenly and invisible Creator, who inhabiteth eternity ; that this communion should be open to all who desire it and who use the means by which it is to be obtained ; and, finally, that by this communion alone, man can attain to that degree of perfection of which he is capable ; these are things, indeed, which a reasonable man will not expect to be apprehended by those whose views are confined to matter, to the pursuit of the knowledge connected with it, and to the desire after the good which it can bestow.

In the present day, these difficulties, as they affect the ministry and influence of the teachers of Religion with the educated classes, are beyond measure increased, from the operation of two causes in particular. On the one hand, the systems of Metaphysics and of Ethics generally received, appear to be built on insufficient foundations, and the mind, restless and unsatisfied in its inquiries into the first and greatest of all subjects, turns in despair to those lower matters of scientific

inquiry, where its researches will, at least, be attended by more satisfaction. On the other hand, vast and rapid improvements have taken place in all the arts which contribute to comfort and luxury. By both these causes the natural bias of the mind to dwell exclusively in its lower state, and its indisposition to the reception of spiritual and elevated truth, have been fearfully increased. I mean not that religion, if we be contented with paying service to its name, is in these days particularly rejected or despised; but that the feelings with which it is too often treated and accepted by men of the world, are such as, virtually at least, make the question between the comparative merits of the religion of our Lord, and the religion of Mahomet or of Bramah, between the worship of Jehovah, and the worship of Jupiter, a question of difference rather of degree than of kind. On the speculative side, men of the world admit the existence of a moral Governor, a future state, and the excellence of the Christian theory of morals. On the practical and positive, religion is considered, as it has been happily expressed, as a supplement to Law, and an aid to Police¹; and

¹ Coleridge's *Aids to Reflection*, p. 292; a book of which (without assenting to all which it contains) I may truly say, as of other of Mr. Coleridge's works, that it deserves from every thoughtful mind far more attention than it has gained.

it is asked in words, first used by a Protestant Prelate (but doubtless in a qualified sense), What is religion good for, but to reform the manners and dispositions of men, to restrain human nature from violence and cruelty, from falsehood and treachery, from sedition and rebellion¹? Its utility in this view is perhaps condescendingly recognized, and even that of a ministry sometimes acknowledged, as being a body of men whose business it is to enforce the obligations to good order and moral duty, and to terrify those who might hope to evade human laws, by holding up to their imagination and their fears an invisible power, and a future retribution. But any belief that God has himself instituted certain means, through the medium of which he confers internal and spiritual grace, any belief that through these means he seeks to open that communion with his creatures without which the high gifts of reason, of genius, of the soul itself, if not as worthless and as dead as this fair bodily frame when the spark of life is gone, yet subsist in a low and degraded state, any such belief, I fear, exists not, in the present day, with any large portion of mankind. The efficacy of the Christian Sacraments, as means of grace, is not only practically despised, but speculatively (I can hardly say, disbelieved, but)

¹ Tillotson, Sermon XIX. Vol. i. p. 206. fol. ed.

passed by with contempt. And even if the thoughts of those sacraments could be deemed worthy of a moment's attention, still more contemptuous would be the rejection of all belief in the notion that they who are really ministers of the living God, possess in that character any powers beyond other men, and that the means of grace, offered through them in the Gospel, must, to obtain their full effect, be received through them by the Christian world. With how much stronger words, indeed, would Hooker have deplored in these days what he had some cause to deplore in his own! 'That, as for the power of orders considered by itself, such reputation it hath in the eye of this present world, that they which affect it, rather need encouragement to bear contempt, than deserve blame as men of aspiring minds¹.' The feelings, however, with which truth may be received and regarded, do not alter its nature, or diminish its excellence, but the evil is, that popular opinion often induces an unmerited neglect of what it has improperly rejected. Carried away by the stream, men forget, or become unable to examine fairly, that to which their candour would have induced them, on examination, to assent under happier circumstances, as its intrinsic importance would have led them to adopt it as a

¹ Hooker, Eccl. Pol. B. v. § 77.

principle of action. Such, I am persuaded, is too often the case with regard to the nature of the ministry.

I fear too that this false and unjust valuation of the powers of the Christian ministry is not confined to the laity, but in some instances may be found amongst the future, and even the actual members of the ministry themselves. Much indeed is it to be feared, that some men content themselves with an assent to the points of faith enumerated in the Articles, and then take the ministry on themselves, with little feeling of its real dignity and importance ; with little feeling, that, as it confers on them a higher character and additional privileges, so it requires from them the sacrifice of personal wishes and convenience, and the fullest devotion of their time and their talents, their whole heart, their whole mind, their whole strength. Now where such deficient views, or any thing approaching to them, prevail, it need not be said how languid and lifeless will be the professional efforts and exertions of those who hold them, and how little their order has to expect at their hands but the evil of neglect, or the more positive evil of unworthy conduct. On the other hand, a just and exalted view of the privileges with which the minister of God is gifted, and of the work whereunto he is called, must effectually tend to create and to cherish the devotion of the whole

man to the office. It is therefore my intention, in the following discourses, to set before that part of my hearers, especially, which is destined for the ministry, those plain and simple proofs which have in every age of the Church been deemed conclusive as to the truth of the following propositions : that a ministry is one of the means of grace, instituted by God himself, for objects and reasons sufficiently apparent even to us ; that every real and actual minister of God receives his commission from God himself, although through the agency of man, or in other words, that there is no human power competent of itself to call men to the priest's office. I shall then endeavour to clear this doctrine from several objections and misrepresentations, to draw from it certain practical inferences, and point out the influence which it must necessarily have on the studies, the pursuits, and the conduct of those who embrace it in sincerity and truth. These things are old, indeed so old, that were it not the especial misfortune of truth to be sometimes neglected, and sometimes forgotten, it would be unjustifiable to dwell on them in these days. But we follow too often, in these matters, a wrong, and, I am sure, an unworthy plan. We are guilty, it is to be feared, occasionally, of that trifling with truth, that accommodation of offensive doctrines to the taste of a corrupt and unspiritual age, of which the Rationalists have

accused our Lord and his Apostles. Our business is not to inquire into the adaptation of a doctrine to the taste and requirements of the age in which we live, but to see whether it wears the character of an eternal truth ; whether it is a part and parcel of that system which the Son of God himself came to teach. Our business is not to inquire whether an ordinance will be readily accepted, and its usefulness admitted by the men of our age, but whether it be one of those positive ordinances, which their adoption and promulgation by God pronounce to be indispensable means to the great end of Christianity, the salvation of our souls. If we pass by in silence that which is positive, and therefore indispensable, others will soon learn the lesson from us ; soon learn, not to consider truths or ordinances, or the religion to which they belong, as the *indispensable* means of improvement of the heart. Contenting themselves with the belief that they are pursuing the same end by other means, they will soon learn to inquire, with the temper of the Syrian, whether Abana and Pharpar, the rivers of Damascus, are not better than all the waters of Israel ?

The view, then, under which the subject presents itself to our consideration, is this. Our blessed Lord, as the Scriptures assure us, offered himself on the cross, not only to make atonement for the sins of

the whole world, but also to provide a remedy for the general corruption of man's nature, and to restore that free communication of grace and favour from the Creator to the creature, without which man cannot be purified or improved, without which he can neither think nor do any good thing¹. A change of heart is at once announced in the Gospel as necessary, and is made practicable, assistance for the effectuation of that change being offered in various means of grace, but most and chiefest of all in the Christian sacraments. This offer of grace was not made to any one age, or to any one country. It is to spread as far as the world spreads, and to last as long as the world lasts. But when we come to have in view the administration of ordinances, the permanence of those ordinances, and the propagation, through the world, of a knowledge of them,

¹ In so saying I must not be thought to limit the benefits of Christ's death, or deny them to those on whom the light of the Gospel perhaps never shone; for in these extraordinary cases, the mercy of God may provide an extraordinary remedy. They who have never named the name of Jesus, nor known the power of his death, may yet feel the riches of his goodness, and the sweet fragrance of the Rose of Sharon may be shed over the deserts trodden only by the foot of uncivilized man, and the cheerless abodes of the distant inhabitants of the isles of the sea. I speak only of the ordinary case of those who live within the sound of the Gospel, and may enjoy the full efficacy of the means of grace which it offers.

and of the grace which they offer, there necessarily arises the question, By what agency is all this to be effected?

We are led to make the same inquiry by pursuing another train of thought. They who admit the evidence of Scripture, can feel no doubt that it was our Lord's intention to found an external Society of his followers in this world¹. Their admission into it, and their continued adherence to its principles, were, it seems, to be indicated by certain external ceremonies, to which spiritual privileges of a very exalted character were attached. But besides this, a constant enforcement of the moral and spiritual truths contained in the system is obviously and clearly commanded. And this Society, and consequently these rites which belonged to it, were to endure while the world lasted. But even this was not all; for every effort was to be made to extend this Society in space, as well as to prolong it in time, and to induce all mankind to adopt its principles. Here then are implied, for the fulfilment of this design of the Founder of this Society, public and regular ministrations, and public and constant teaching, both within and without the pale of the Society. Again then we must ask, By what agency is all this to be effected?

¹ See Bennet's Rights of the Clergy, ch. i.

The Society is in possession, let us allow, of the Word of God, and of the promise of his Spirit, with the conditions on which that promise is made. It is made, we may farther allow, to all the members of the Society. Does it follow that all are consequently able to apprehend and apply it to their own advantage without assistance, to understand the conditions, and to fulfil them, without guidance and direction? How shall I understand the written word¹ unless some man guide me? is the inquiry,

¹ Let it not be said that we neglect or undervalue the blessing of the Scriptures, or their efficacy to impart the glad tidings of salvation. Neither, on the other hand, would we join in those unfounded and exaggerated assertions of Protestantism under some forms, which seem to limit Providence to the *exclusive* use of Scripture in that blessed work. Scripture is, in truth, one and one only of the external agents in the conversion of the sinner or the heathen, and in the confirmation of the saint and the Christian. It is the great storehouse of revealed truth, and is at once, therefore, to the teacher, that armoury, from which *alone* he is to draw the weapons of his warfare, that remedy against error and innovation of doctrine in himself, which human infirmity ever requires, and that outward sign and witness on earth to the truth and value of his exhortations, which is necessary to convince and constrain his flock. Farther than this we may not presume to go, higher than this we must not place the *necessity* for Scripture, as an agent for the promotion of Christianity, for we speak not now of the varied blessings and comforts which it brings to the individual under all the

not of the unconverted Ethiopian alone, but of all that vast majority of the Christian world, to whom

varied circumstances of life. On the contrary, humanly speaking, it seems far easier to imagine that the doctrines of Christianity might be taught, the word preached, and the means of grace offered by the intervention of a living ministry alone, than to see how all the vast and comprehensive schemes of Christianity could be accomplished by the mere agency of the Scriptures.

Waterland, in his invaluable Tract on Justification, (Works, Vol. ix. p. 435,) observes, with respect to the Christian covenant, that ‘according to the natural order of precedency, the authorized minister is *first* in consideration, (Rom. x. 13—15. Tit. i. 3,) the word next, then hearing and believing; after that baptism, and therein, the first solemn reception of justification,’ &c. Hooker, (Eccles. Polity, V. 76, *prope finem*,) has the following admirable passage: ‘Religion, without the help of spiritual ministry, is unable to plant itself, the fruits thereof not possible to grow of their own accord. Which last assertion is herein as the first, that it needeth no farther confirmation; if it did, I could easily declare, how all things which are of God, he hath by wonderful art and wisdom soldered, as it were, together, with the glue of mutual assistance, appointing the lowest to receive from the nearest to themselves what the influence of the highest yieldeth. And therefore, the Church, being the most absolute of all his works, was in reason also to be ordered with like harmony, that what he worketh might no less in grace than in nature be effected by hands and instruments duly subordinated unto the power of his own Spirit; a thing both needful for the humiliation of man, which would not willingly be debtor to any, but to himself, and of no small effect to nourish that

their heavenly Father's will has assigned the active and unsanctifying duties of this world, but whom his wisdom and mercy have still required to prepare themselves for another. To have that knowledge of the Word of God, which can enable us to teach the religion which it contains to others, implies assuredly no ordinary qualifications, qualifications which, beyond dispute, require thought and study and perseverance for their attainment. This is indeed so strongly and generally felt, that almost every sect sees the necessity of having stated teachers; and in the only remarkable case of exception, that of the Quakers, perhaps a still stronger testimony to this necessity is virtually given by their leading tenet, that an immediate Revelation is made by God to the heart of every believer. On that tenet, it is obvious, their rejection of a stated ministry depends, and would not be tenable without it. Where there is so general a consent on a point, it would be waste of time to argue it¹, nor

divine love which now maketh each embrace other, not as men but as angels of God.'

¹ The reader will have the kindness to remember, that as I afterwards hold myself able to show that Scripture directs the establishment of a particular Ministry, I do not feel it necessary to show here that it directs the establishment of a Ministry generally. Where a point is of such a nature that reasonable men admit it at once, it cannot be necessary to have recourse to

can resistless arguments on this matter fail to present themselves to every mind¹. Assuming then the necessity of some ministry, the question arises, What is to be its appointment and what is its authority? Who are authorized to declare the terms of the Gospel Covenant, to offer those outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual grace promised in that Covenant, which were ordained by Christ himself, as a means by which the faithful Christian might receive the grace, and a pledge to assure him of it? And who are to carry the knowledge of the Gospel Covenant to lands where its joyful sound has not yet been heard? who are to be the messengers that shall pass with beautiful feet over the mountains, and descend into the gloomy valleys where the light yet never shone?

Before we inquire, what answer Revelation affords to the inquiry, we may observe, that the reply which reason (if the matter were left to her decision, nay, if she were to decide as to the course to be pursued in a society existing only for the enforcement and promotion of moral views and of natural religion) would dictate, is

Revelation. The *nodus* is not *tali vindice dignus*. And in general we find Revelation speaking only implicitly on such points, and *assuming* them.

¹ It may perhaps be well to refer the uninformed reader to the convincing pages of Leslie and Bennet.

contained in what the Church says on this subject in her twenty-third Article. It is virtually this—that it is unlawful for any man to take on him this office before he is lawfully called to it, *i. e.* called by men who have public authority in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard. The reasonableness of this answer, as far as it goes, can hardly be called in question, even if the Church be received in the low and unworthy light of a society for the promotion of morality. For even then, whatever arguments¹ show the advantage, or rather the necessity, of every system having its own peculiar officers to carry it into effect, and the certainty of disorder and confusion, nay, the loss of a large share of the benefits of the system, where this precaution is neglected; whatever arguments show that it is better to have qualified than unqualified officers, and that knowledge, and experience, and fitness, are better qualifications than ignorance and incompetence, all these arguments apply most strictly to the case of the Church, and prove that it is only right, and reasonable, and fitting that Ministers should be appointed, that others should judge of their qualifications, and that no one should

¹ See Appendix, No. 1, where a full view of the arguments in favour of a Church government, on the ground of expediency, is given.

presume of himself to intrude into the office. He, indeed, who thinks of Christianity only as a system of morality, must allow that very high qualifications are necessary for the teachers of any such system, and that the worst consequences, confusion, and error, and fanaticism, must inevitably ensue, if any one, merely on an opinion of his own qualification, should undertake so important a ministry and office.

But although the Church, in the Article I have alluded to, goes far enough to exclude all erroneous fancies of the rights of self-appointed teachers, there were many considerations at the time when the Articles were composed, which probably prevented those who framed them from inserting in their public confession of faith any thing of a nature much more decided. Above all, the unhappy condition of the foreign Protestants¹, who experienced

¹ Bishop Hall has the following remark on this subject:—
‘ Know, their case and yours is far enough different. They plead to be, by a kind of necessity, cast upon that condition which you have willingly chosen. They were not, they could not be, what you were, and still might have been. Did any of them forsake and abjure that function of episcopacy which he might freely have enjoyed with the full liberty of professing the reformed religion? It is true, many bishops have been faulty in their own persons, and condemned too justly of exorbitance in managing their calling; but when the calling is, as it should be, severed from these exceptions to the person, did ever any wise

numerous difficulties unknown to us, and were prevented from adopting the same Church Govern-

man or Christian Church, condemn that calling for itself?' After mentioning what the opinions of Calvin* and the French Protestants are, he goes on to quote the confession of Augsburg, and after having done so, he adds, 'Thus those learned divines and Protestants of Germany; wherein all the world sees the apologist professeth for them that they greatly desired to conserve the government of bishops; that they were altogether unwillingly driven from it; that it was utterly against their heart, that it should have been impaired or weakened; that it was only the personal cruelty and violence of the Romish persecutors, in a bloody opposition to the doctrine of the Gospel, which was then excepted against.' The bishop then cites the opinions of Melancthon, Bucer, Beza, and others, and concludes with the following remarks:—

'What should I need to thicken the air with clouds of witnessess? There is witness enough in the late Synod of Dort. When the Bishop of Llandaff had, in a speech of his, touched upon episcopal government, and showed, that though the want thereof gave opportunities to those divisions which were then on foot in the Netherlands: Bogermannus, the President of that assembly, stood up, and in a good allowance of what had been

* Calvin in so many words says, that they who oppose an hierarchy, where the bishops do not refuse to be subject to Christ, are worthy of an anathema. *Tract. Theol. omn. in unum volumen congesti*, p. 69. How this was understood by a foreign Protestant may be seen from a Letter of De l'Anglès, at the end of Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*. See also the same Vol. of Calvin's *Tracts*, p. 125, where he confesses that the Presbyterian discipline is not that of the ancient Church.

ment as ourselves by external circumstances, far more than by any scruples on their own parts, presented strong objections to any statement which should loudly condemn their practice, openly invalidate their ministry, and thus weaken the general cause of Protestantism, and give aid to the common enemy. The Fathers of our Church have not, however, neglected to give a deliberate record of their opinions on this subject, when in the thirty-

spoken, said, *Domine, nos non sumus adeo felices*: "Alas! my Lord, we are not so happy." Neither did he speak thus in a fashionable compliment; neither the person, nor the place, nor the hearers were fit for that, but in a sad gravity, and conscientious profession of a known truth. Neither would he, being the mouthpiece of that select assembly, have thought it safe to pass those words before the deputies of the States, and so many venerable divines of foreign parts, (besides their own,) if he had not supposed this so clear a truth as that synod would neither disrelish or contradict.

'What do I single out a few? All the world of men, judicious, and not prejudiced with their own interests, both do and must say thus; and confess, with learned Casaubon *, Fregeville, and Saravia, that no Church in the world comes so near to the apostolic form as the Church of England.' Hall's *Divine Right of Episcopacy*. *Introduction*, Sections 2, 3, and 4. See also Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*; Durel's *View of the Government and Worship of the Reformed Churches*; and Toplady's *Works*, Vol. ii. p. 151, and following, for more evidence.

* See Durel's *View of the Reformed Churches*, p. 296.

sixth Article, they refer to the order for consecrating and ordaining all the orders of the Christian ministry, as containing all that is necessary for lawful ordination, and nothing that is superstitious or ungodly¹. And this was the more necessary, because, when the first question, as to the persons qualified to minister, is decided by the express exclusion of all not lawfully called by the men having authority in the congregation, a second question arises, second in order, but far the first in importance, namely, whence this authority is derived? To this inquiry these two answers might obviously be given. It might first be said, as it has often been, that although all men are equally qualified, and equally privileged to teach, yet for the sake of good order and decorum, it is agreed on by the congregation, not merely to have regular ministers, but to delegate to certain other persons, the power of nominating and choosing them. But there is here a gross and obvious fallacy; for from the assumed equal rights of men in the societies, which regulate their intercourse with one another, it is inferred that they have equal rights in that especial society, which regulates their intercourse with God. It is thus assumed that in the spiritual

¹ I find that this argument is put exactly in the same way in Brett's *Lay Baptism Invalid*, Appendix, p. 122. See too the Preface to the forms of Ordaining and Consecrating.

communion between God and man, God has no superintendence, and that he would never mark out the line for the dispensation and distribution of his own gifts and graces ; and thus man arrogates to himself of his own right, what of his own right he cannot offer an argument to show that he possesses ¹. Reason, indeed, Scripture and history alike overturn this account, nor are the intrinsic objections to it less fatal. The call or appointment here spoken of, can have no other force than human laws confer on it ; but if religion be any thing, it empowers us to condemn human laws, when they interfere with the law of God. What power then could such a ministry have, what power, I mean, beyond the force of the secular arm, to restrain or convince those who rejected it, and pleaded the obligation of the law of God, either to acknowledge Christ alone as the Head of his Church, and under the idea that he established no human authority in his Church, to admit none ; or on the other hand, to admit such an authority as they might conceive was established by him and his immediate followers ? The other answer, that

¹ It might perhaps, for argument's sake, be alleged that the Apostles sanctioned such a mode of appointment, and that, consequently, ordinations so made have Divine authority. But such an assertion must be given up as soon as authorities are required, as it is in the teeth of all history. See *Jus Divinum*, p. 129.

the authority is derived from God himself, embraces, what we believe to be, the true view of the question, and consists either of facts susceptible of proof, or of probabilities so strong, as to assume almost the same nature and value.

There is in truth, both in the nature of things, and in the human mind, such a connexion between ministering and a minister, between teaching and a teacher, that even on reasonable grounds it would seem all but impossible, that the Founder of this system should not have provided¹ for these impor-

¹ ‘*Omnis cœtus ac societas, religionis præsertim et divini cultus causa congregata, repente diffluat rursus et concidat necesse est, nisi rectoribus doctoribusque instruatur, certisque legibus et institutis colligetur. Quare J. C. quum perpetuum esse vellet regnum suum, non potuit quin ordinem docentium institueret in eo, omniaque decenter ac apte constitui et ordinari juberet.*’
Moshem. Instit. Hist. Chræ. Maj. Sæc. i. p. ii. c. ii. § 5.—

‘As there is no nation in the world but where they profess some religion or other, so there is no religion professed in the world but where they have some person or other set apart for the celebration of the several rites and ceremonies in it, without which, indeed, it is impossible that any religion should subsist. For if no places were set apart for the worship of God, men would soon worship him nowhere; if no times, they would never worship him: so if no persons were set apart for it, none would ever do it at all, at least not so as they ought. And if it be so in natural, how much more in revealed religion, of which this seems to be one of the integral or essential parts; without which it is not that religion which God hath revealed: for

tant ends, should not have provided for the government of his society; that when it was his especial aim that his doctrines should be taught and spread, and his precepts enforced, he should not have

wheresoever he, the great Creator and Governor of the world, hath revealed his will and pleasure to his creatures, how he would have them worship and serve him that made them, he hath still, at the same time, constituted certain officers amongst them to assist them in it; which officers being, as it were, his own domestics, or immediate servants or ministers, waiting continually upon himself and his service, he always hath reserved to himself the constitution or ordination of them, not suffering any one that had a mind to it to meddle with any thing belonging to the said officers, without his leave and order first obtained. And if any presume to do it, he doth not only make what they do void, and of no effect, but he punisheth them severely for it, as we find by many instances in Holy Scripture.'—Bishop Beveridge's Works, Vol. ii. pp. 108, 9.

'Since men to the world's end are to be saved by believing the Gospel, then there is a necessity that there should be always an order of men in the world whose business it should be to preach this Gospel; for, as St. Paul truly argues, How shall men believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a preacher? and how shall they preach unless they be sent? If Christ designed that the belief of his Gospel should be the way of salvation as long as the world lasts, he must certainly have designed that there should be men set apart to preach and make known this Gospel as long as the world lasts likewise.'—Sharp's Sermons, Vol. v. p. 212. See also Sect. i. of Taylor's Episcopacy asserted, where the question is admirably argued.

pointed out who were to teach and spread the one, and enforce the other. I would first observe, that I here assume it as a matter proved¹, that there are in the Society of Christians certain ordinances of perpetual obligation enjoined by Divine authority. If this be admitted, and if what has been previously said as to the necessity of due qualifications in the managers of any system, be admitted also, it would seem difficult to resist the consequence, that there would be every reason to believe, independently on Revelation, that God had provided for the due continuance of the ministry. ‘If the Lord,’ says one of the Presbyterian authorities, ‘had only appointed ordinances to continue, and had appointed none to administer them, then the ordinances would fail, because that which is every man’s work, is usually and effectually no man’s work, and though God hath immediately appointed these ordinances, he doth not now immediately administer them².’

So far then we have already gone. We have

¹ See Bennet’s Rights of the Clergy, ch. ii., and his Confutation of Quakerism, ch. xxii. xxiii. xxiv., where he examines John iii. 5, Eph. iv. 5, Matt. xxviii. 19, Eph. v. 26, Tit. iii. 5, 1 Pet. iii. 21, Acts ii. 38, Rom. vi. 3, 4. Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangel. ch. ii. Potter on Church Government, ch. v.

² Jus Divinum Ministerii Evang. ch. ii. p. 20. See too Potter on Church Government, ch. iv.

noticed that there is reason to believe that, in every system of extensive requirements, regular officers are required ; and we have shown that, on grounds of reason, it cannot be wise or right to let them be of self-appointment. We have then gone on to show that there is no proof whatever that the Society itself has power to appoint such officers ; and, on the ground of the perpetuity of the ordinances made by Divine institution, we have argued that it is *probable*, at least, that the officers who are to administer those ordinances are of Divine institution also. The consideration ¹ of the scrip-

¹ In the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evang.* ch. i. the question is thus argued, proofs being brought under each head :

1. If God has peculiarly designed persons to the Ministry, then it is a Divine institution. But he has peculiarly, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : the Priests and Levites—the Apostles—Seventy Disciples—Prophets, Evangelists, &c.—Teachers, Pastors. Note again the charge of the Holy Spirit to the Church of Ephesus.

2. If God has given peculiar names and titles to persons designed for this office, then the office is of Divine institution. But he has given, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : Pastors, Teachers, Stewards of the Mysteries of God, Embassadors, Preachers, &c. in various parts of God's word.

3. If the Lord has appointed peculiar gifts and qualifications to such persons as are designed for the Ministry, then it is of Divine institution. But he has appointed, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : That they should be apt to teach, hold fast the word, study to show themselves approved to God, rightly divide the

tural and historical grounds, by which this probability will rise to a certainty, must be deferred until my next discourse.

Before the close of the present discourse, I am anxious to meet by anticipation an objection which is often made to the view which I advocate. When we look into the world, and see how many sects

truth, be proved by others, (1 Tim. iii. 6,) that hands be not suddenly laid on them, &c.

4. If God requires peculiar duties from the Ministry, then it is of Divine institution. But he has, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : They are to take the oversight of the flock, not to neglect the gift that is in them, wholly to mind this work and office, to give themselves wholly to these things, to preach the word, rebuke, exhort, ordain others, to watch as they that must give account of the flock, &c.

5. If God requires peculiar duties from the people to the teachers, then the office is of Divine institution. But God requires, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : To know their Teachers as them who are over them in the Lord, to remember those who have spoken the word of God to them, highly to esteem them for their work's sake, to obey them and submit to them (Heb. xiii. 17), to encourage them (ibid.), to maintain them. (Gal. vi. 6, and 1 Cor. ix. 7—14.)

6. If God has made particular promises to them that work in this Ministry, then the office is of Divine institution. But God has, &c. Therefore, &c. Instances : He will be with them, he will make them able Ministers of the New Testament; what they bind or loose, he will bind or loose ; he will account that those who receive his Ministers, receive him, &c.

of Christians differ entirely from ourselves, and yet exhibit the most sincere and earnest zeal for the promotion of our common object, there is something very painful to the mind in passing any sentence of blame or censure upon them¹; and

¹ The following observations are taken from a Charge delivered by Bishop Hobart in 1817, and printed at New York in 1818: (p. 26.) 'In opposing, under great, and perhaps, if we may judge from the spirit of the age, increasing odium, those prevalent errors which, if I know my own heart, a profound sense of duty alone has induced me to endeavour to refute; and in maintaining and enforcing correct views of the constitution of the Christian Church, and of the principles of Church unity, we must be consoled and supported by the consideration that we are maintaining the principles of the saints of the primitive ages, and for which, sooner than relinquish them, *they* would have shed their blood. What though it may be said that these principles would limit the communion of the Church to a small portion of professing Christians, and place in a state of schism a large number of the Christian family? If these principles be true, their obligation cannot be weakened, nor their importance diminished, by the number, the piety, or the zeal of their opponents. The general prevalence of error hitherto permitted by the counsels of an inscrutable Providence, is a trial of our faith, but ought not to weaken or subvert it. Was not the revelation of God's will confined from the beginning to a small number of the human race in the plains of Shinar, and in the fields of Jordan? Are not large portions of the globe still under the dominion of the prince and powers of darkness? It is not for man to arraign the dominion of the Most High! For purposes wise and good, but inscrutable by us, did he not permit heresies early to stain

assuredly, in these days, a proposition which, like that which will appear in my next discourse, tends to cast a shade ¹ on all the congregations of Christians which reject an apostolical Ministry, will be

the purity of the faith? Was there not a period when the divinity of his blessed Son was doubted and denied by a large portion of the Christian world; and when a venerable defender of this fundamental truth was hunted by his persecutors throughout the earth? Did not the dark cloud of Papal superstition for ages disfigure and conceal the primitive splendour of the Christian Zion? And need we wonder then, that for purposes equally wise and good, but equally inscrutable, the Sovereign of the universe still permits heresies to corrupt and schisms to distract the Christian family? He will finally do right: he searches and mercifully judges the purposes of the heart; and assuredly, honest purity of intention, and zealous endeavour to know and to do his will, will not fail of a reward from him who is no respecter of persons, but is the equal and kind parent of all the human race. Still charity, though it should always soften the rigid features of truth, cannot change her divine character, nor dispense with her sacred obligations.’—*The Corruptions of the Church of Rome contrasted with certain Protestant Errors; a Charge, by Bishop Hobart, pp. 26—28.*

¹ ‘I confess I do not approve tumultuary reformations, made by a giddy ignorant multitude, according to the dictates of a seditious orator. But withal, I must tell him, that God would not permit evil, but that he knows how to extract good out of evil, and that he often useth ill agents to do his own works, yea, even to reform his Church. Jehu was none of the best men, yet God used him, to purge his Church, and to take away the Priests of Baal. The treason of Judas became subservient to the secret

received with dislike and repugnance. For the plan of the present age is to admit that all men, counsels of God for the redemption of the world, by the cross and passion of Christ. I do also acknowledge, that Episcopacy was comprehended in the Apostolic office, *tanquam trigonus in tetragono*, and that the distinction was made by the Apostles, with the approbation of Christ; that the Angels of the seven Churches in the Revelations were seven Bishops; that it is the most silly, ridiculous thing in the world, to calumniate that for a Papal innovation, which was established in the Church before there was a pope at Rome; which hath been received and approved in all ages, since the very cradle of Christianity, by all sorts of Christians, Europeans, Africans, Asiatics, Indians, many of which never had any intercourse with Rome, nor scarcely ever heard of the name of Rome. If *semper, ubique, et ab omnibus*, be not a sufficient plea, I know not what is.

‘But because I esteem them Churches not *completely* formed, do I therefore exclude them from all hope of salvation? or esteem them aliens and strangers from the commonwealth of Israel? or account them formal schismatics? No such thing. First, I know there are many learned persons among them, who do passionately affect Episcopacy; some of which have acknowledged to myself, that their Church would never be rightly settled, till it was new moulded. Baptism is a Sacrament, the door of Christianity, a matriculation in the Church of Christ. Yet the very desire of it, in case of necessity, is sufficient to excuse from the want of actual Baptism. And is not the desire of Episcopacy sufficient to excuse from the actual want of Episcopacy in like cases of necessity? or should I censure these as schismatics?

‘Secondly: there are others, who though they do not long so much for Episcopacy, yet they approve it, and want it only out of invincible necessity. In some places the sovereign prince is

however unfounded, however wild, and however extravagant their schemes, are equally right, or of another communion; the Episcopal chairs are filled with Romish bishops. If they should petition for bishops of their own, it would not be granted. In other places, the magistrates have taken away bishops, whether out of policy, because they thought that regiment not so proper for their republics, or because they were ashamed to take away the revenues, and preserve the order, or out of a blind zeal, they have given an account to God, they owe none to me. Should I condemn all these as schismatics for want of Episcopacy, who want it out of an invincible necessity?

‘Thirdly : there are others, who have neither the same desires nor the same esteem of Episcopacy, but condemn it as an anti-Christian innovation, and a rag of Popery. I conceive this to be most gross schism materially. It is ten times more schismatical to desert, nay, to take away, (so much as lies in them,) the whole order of bishops, than to subtract obedience from one lawful bishop. All that can be said to mitigate this fault is, that they do it ignorantly, as they have been mistaught and misinformed. And I hope many of them are free from obstinacy, and hold the truth implicitly in the preparation of their minds, being ready to receive it, when God shall reveal it to them. How far this may excuse (not the crime but) their persons from formal schism, either *a toto* or *a tanto*, I determine not, but leave them to stand or fall before their own Master.’—Archbishop Bramhall’s Works, fol. edit. p. 164.

As this is a subject of great interest, I subjoin a passage on the point from another divine. Field says, (Of the Church, B. iii. c. 39,) ‘There is no reason to be given but that *in case of necessity*, wherein all bishops were extinguished by death, or being fallen into heresie, should refuse to ordaine any to serve

equally likely to be so with ourselves—to fraternize with every class and every opinion—and by the aid of unmeaning and indefinite expressions, to give to falsehood and disorder a participation in the blessings and the honour of order and truth. And this is termed charity, this is dignified by the

God in his true worship, but that Presbyters, as they may doe all other acts, whatsoever special challenge bishops in ordinary course make unto them, might doe this also; who then dare condemne all those worthy ministers of God, that were ordained by Presbyters in sundry churches in the world, at such times as bishops in those parts where they lived, opposed themselves against the trueth of God, and persecuted such as professed it? And again, (B. V. c. 27,) ‘None may ordaine but they only, unlesse it be in cases of extreame necessity, as when all bishops are extinguished by death, or, fallen into heresie, obstinately refuse to ordain men to preach the Gospel of Christ sincerely.’ And although he thinks that there is no difference between bishops and presbyters in point of orders, he thinks that ‘by the decree of the Apostles, to avoid schism, pre-eminence was given to one called the bishop;’ and he concludes this 27th chapter with saying that that decree will make all ordinations by any other than a bishop (except in case of *extreme necessity*) void.—See also Bennet on Schism, ch. x. xi. Brett (*Lay Baptism Invalid*, Appendix, p. cxxv.) argues this case, on the other side, very strongly, and says, that in the first place, no one who believes Christ’s promises, and believes Episcopacy to be the true form, will believe that it ever can be utterly extinguished. If it were, he thinks, it would be our duty to wait for a fresh Revelation, and not usurp God’s prerogative, by claiming the right of instituting a ministry.

specious and imposing name of liberality, and the outcry is raised against all who dissent from the practice ! A superficial liberality—a false and hollow charity. For Christian charity is something higher, oh ! far, far, higher than this. The first of all things in the eye of a Christian, is Truth. That is the jewel he seeks, the pearl of great price which he gives all his treasure to buy. That, and that only, must be taught, plainly, simply, and without fear of offence ; and, though with discretion, without fear of consequences, or of imputations. It can make no compromise with falsehood, it can invest her with no ray of its own Divine splendour, but must proclaim eternal and irreconcilable war with all that bears her name. But because it so wars against falsehood, so detests and so exposes it, does it therefore detest those who are deceived, or feel any bitterness against those who are in conscientious error ? God forbid. The Christian, while he regrets their error, and seeks to avert its evil effects on the cause of the Gospel, remembers ever that they who hold it are his brethren—the children of the same Father, with one hope and one home. He beholds them with sincere and unaffected love, his earnest wish and desire is to reclaim them from error and to lead them into truth, and when all his efforts are vain, he sees their defeat with regret, but without bitterness. He must still proclaim the

truth¹, for that is a sacred duty to truth and its eternal fountain, the holy and everlasting God; he must still speak the language of condemnation

¹ 'In this Discourse I have no aim to displease any, nor any hope to please all. If I can help on truth in the Church, and the peace of the Church together, I shall be glad, be it in any measure: nor shall I spare to speak necessary truth out of too much love of peace; nor thrust on unnecessary truth to the breach of that peace, which once broken, is not so easily soldered again. And if for necessary truth's sake only, any man will be offended, nay take, nay snatch at that offence which is not given, I know no fence for that. 'Tis truth, and I must tell it; 'tis the Gospel, and I must preach it. (1 Cor. ix.) And far safer it is in this case to bear anger from men than a woe from God. And when the foundations of faith are shaken, be it by superstition or profaneness, he that puts not to his hand as firmly as he can to support them, is too weary, and hath more care of himself than of the cause of Christ; and 'tis a weariness that brings more danger in the end than it shuns: for the angel of the Lord issued out a curse against the inhabitants of Meroz because they came not to help the Lord, to help the Lord against the mighty. (Judges v.) I know 'tis a great ease to let every thing be as it will, and every man believe and do as he lists. But whether governors in Church or State do their duty there while is easily seen, since this is an effect of no king in Israel. (Judges xvii.)—Archbishop Laud's Conference with Fisher, *Preface*, p. 12 (a work which, I presume, it is not necessary to recommend even to the youngest divine, as perhaps the most masterly view existing of most of the points in controversy between our Church and the Church of Rome. But I cannot help observing, that due justice is not done to the extraordinary power of eloquence displayed in it. As a single specimen, I

to falsehood, but he speaks the language of love and of kindness to those whose opinions he would refer to Laud's proof that Scripture is Divine, § 16. N. 34. p. 8. I know few passages superior to it).

‘Is the charge of bigotry against the high churchman founded on the fact, that in his efforts for propagating Christianity, and for extending the kingdom of Jesus Christ, he devotes himself to the extension of his own Church exclusively? And if a correct spirit, manner, and means, are cherished and employed by him, the imputation is unfair and unjust. He regards the Church which the Redeemer and his Apostles founded, as subsisting under certain distinctive and essential principles of doctrine, ministry, sacraments, and worship; he regards his own Church (every duly constituted Episcopal Church) as possessing these essentials. In advancing, then, his own Church, he propagates, in his view, the Gospel, as Christ and his Apostles proclaimed it: he extends the kingdom and Church of Christ as they established and extended it. In what other way is it to be expected that he should propagate the Gospel, or extend the Church of Christ? He may highly respect the varying or opposing denominations of his fellow Christians, and respect individually their character and motives; honour their piety and zeal; cherish esteem for their virtues, and the utmost affection for their persons, and seek to be first among the foremost in the reciprocation of all the endearing charities of social and domestic life. But he remembers that his Redeemer declared, “He who loveth father, or mother, or wife, or children, or brother, or sister, more than me, is not worthy of me.” Hence the principle of supreme love to his Redeemer leads him to love supremely the Church in that form of doctrine, ministry, sacraments, and worship, under which he believes it was constituted by its Divine head.

‘He presumes not to arraign the fitness of the peculiar con-

demns. He reverences the conscientious, and prays for the perverse. He looks forward to that

stitution of Christ's mystical body, wisely and humbly judging that the Divine Personage who came to save the world, knew by what institutions this all-merciful object was best to be accomplished. So far indeed from confining salvation to a state of visible union with Christ's mystical body, he extends the benefits of the Redeemer's merits and grace to the pious and sincere of all sects, and of all nations. But a Divine society being established as the regular and ordinary channel of salvation, his duty is plain to unite himself to that society, and to seek and induce others sincerely to do so, that thus "joined together in one communion and fellowship," they may be "an holy temple acceptable to the Lord."—The High Churchman Vindicated; Bishop Hobart's Fourth Charge, pp. 8, 9. 'With this view I have thought it necessary to maintain *Episcopal* government as essential to the constitution of the Christian Church. That it is the best form of government, may be inferred from its having not only the warrant of Scripture for its institution, but also the constant practice of the Church for its continuance, from the days of the Apostles to the present time. Strong, however, as the authority is on which this declaration is founded, I nevertheless do not take upon myself to say, that the Church may not subsist under any other sort of government; but this I conceive to be a point for God, not man, to determine. Nor do I take upon me to assert that the salvation of Christian people depends *absolutely* and *entirely* upon the lawful calling of their Ministers; for it was not the object of my book to enter into all the circumstances that have taken or may take place among Christians in Church matters: still I do not scruple to say, according to the most decided judgment of the Church from the beginning, that where a *valid Ministry* is established, of which

day when truth shall shine forth and error be re-proved, and while he believes his own humble trust for acceptance in that day to rest on the sure and covenanted mercy of God, he remembers that his God is a God of love, that with him there is uncovenanted mercy, and that by himself we are assured, that it is his earnest desire to bring all the children of his love to one heavenly fold under one Shepherd.

advantage may be taken, it ought to become a matter of very serious and important consideration with Christians, how far any of the ordinances or sacraments of religion can be *duly* and *effectually* administered without it.'—Daubeny's Appendix to the Guide to the Church, pp. 427, 8.

SERMON II.

ST. JOHN XX. 21.

As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.

It was the object of my last discourse to lay before you the considerations which, independently on testimony, render it difficult to doubt that our Lord laid the foundation of a system of government and continuation for the Christian Church. It will be our business to-day to consider the subject in another point of view, and observe how this probability assumes the character of certainty by the aid of the evidence of Scripture and history. This subject has been so often examined, that no hope can be entertained of producing any thing new, nor could novelty be productive of any advantage. My sole object is to set before those who are intended for the ministry a simple and concise view of the nature of their calling, that they who are about to

enter on it in the spirit of zeal and of earnestness, may be confirmed and cheered in their devotion to their Master's cause, by a knowledge of the high privileges which will be bestowed on them ; and that those who are about to take on them the ministry of God in carelessness or from secular motives, may be deterred from their sin, by a knowledge of the arduous duties, and the awful responsibility, which such privileges must entail.

I proceed then to inquire from Scripture and the records of the primitive Church, what was done by our Lord, his Apostles, and their successors in this momentous matter. And the several points in relation to our Lord are these. During his abode on earth, we find that he called ¹ twelve apostles to the exercise of the ministry, and afterwards seventy other disciples, with powers, it would seem, somewhat inferior to the first. The twelve were sent to preach in his name and act as his substitutes in every respect ; while the seventy were only directed to those places where their Master was to follow

¹ At this part of the Sermon I ventured to introduce some remarks on a book then lately published, a translation of Professor Schleiermacher's Work on St. Luke ; but as they appear to me to break the course of the statement, I have preferred transferring them to the Appendix, in the enlarged state in which they have since appeared in the *British Critic*. (No. IV. Oct. 1827, p. 392.) See Appendix.

them, and to supply what had been wanting in their ministration from defect of power or of ability.

It is the opinion of Beveridge¹, that the twelve did not receive their full consecration and sacerdotal power until after our Lord's death, as the Levitical priesthood, itself an ordinance of God, was not abolished till that sacrifice was made. Without examining this opinion, I may at once proceed to the consideration of the full promises and declarations of our Lord after his resurrection. And first I shall observe, that in a passage of St. John's Gospel our Lord declared to the Apostles that 'as his Father sent him, so he sent them²,' words which seem of themselves almost sufficient for our purpose; that immediately after this declaration he breathed on them and said, 'Receive the Holy Ghost;' and assured them that from that time 'whose soever sins they remitted, those sins were remitted; and whose soever sins they retained, were retained.' But with these strong and positive promises, we must join others recorded by St. Matthew³ in a passage wholly undisputed, and confirmed by another of St. Mark⁴, the genuineness of which is admitted even by Eichhorn⁵ himself. We find

¹ Beveridge's Works, Vol. ii. p. 112, in Horne's edition.

² John xx. 21.

³ Matt. xxviii. 19.

⁴ Mark xvi. 15.

⁵ Eichhorn, *Einleitung in das Neue Test.* Vol. i. p. 621—623. 2nd edit. or p. 577—579. 1st edit.

in both a command of our Lord to the Apostles ‘to go and make disciples of all nations and baptize them ;’ and a promise that ‘he would be with them to the end of the world.’

It is not my intention to weary you with entering into the endless and sometimes fruitless controversies which these words have caused, or to inquire what were and what are the bounds of the power given by our Lord to his ministers ¹. I shall rest my cause, as far as concerns our Lord, on the assertion, that if words have any meaning, these words contain a commission, and a provision for its renewal and continuation. The commission will not bear, never has borne, any dispute ; all classes and sects admitting that the Apostles received a commission from their Master. The provision for a renewal has been sometimes disputed by the Rationalizing Christians, but with very little show of argument ². I must, however, observe here,

¹ I refer here to the enormous claims made by the Roman Catholic Church on the one hand, with respect to the powers of the keys, and the equally unreasonable attempt made on the part of Christians of low views to get rid of all meaning attached to the declaration of our Lord on that point. The reader will find a specimen of opposite views in Lampe’s Commentary on John xx. 21, 22.

² See on this subject some very sensible remarks of Dr. Hey, Article XXIII. § 25. The arguments used by the Presbyterians against the supposition that the continuance of an order with

that when our Saviour says that ‘ he sent his Apostles, as the Father sent him,’ he obviously speaks only of his embassy as a Teacher and Minister. He was sent by his Father to die for the sins of the world ; and after that, to enter into glory, and be the Ruler of all things until the consummation of the world. In this sense he certainly did not send his Apostles, but spoke in his lower capacity of a Minister of God on earth, and in that capacity sent his Apostles as the Father sent him. Be it remarked too, in this place, that the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews¹ especially observes, that ‘ as no man taketh the honour of a Priest unto himself, but he that is called of God as was Aaron, so Christ glorified not himself to be an high Priest,’ nor assumed the character till the descent of the Spirit upon him had manifested God’s pleasure and intention. If then Christ sent the Apostles *as* his Father sent him, sent them, that is to say, to do his work after he had departed from the world ; if by that very act he showed that in his ministerial character he had the power of delegating and continuing his authority, could they, to whom he promised the same power as he possessed, conceive

higher powers was included in this commission are well answered by Scott, in his *Christian Life*, Part ii. Vol. ii. Ch. vii. p. 404, ed. 1700.

¹ Heb. v. 4, 5.

that that essential part of it, the right of delegation, was withheld, when the religion was to be continued for ever? Such a power of providing ministers, they must have known, would be far more necessary when the great Shepherd was removed from the external and visible rule of his flock, when the flock was more numerous, when 'its first zeal was perhaps abated, its native simplicity perverted into arts of hypocrisy and forms of godliness, when "heresies should arise, and the love of many wax cold¹."' But again, when Christ gave the command that his ministers, in fulfilment of those ancient and august prophecies which had foretold the everlasting duration and universal dominion of the Gospel, should go and make disciples of all nations, could the Apostles, unless they had been mad enough to imagine that immortality on earth was a part of the gift bestowed on them, could they, I say, have believed²

¹ Jeremy Taylor's Works, Vol. vi. p. 303. Heber's edit. See also Beveridge, Vol. ii. p. 88. Horne's edit.

² See Jeremy Taylor's Divine Institution of the Office Ministerial, § 11. The following are the words of Archbishop Sharp, Sermon. XIII. Vol. v. p. 212.—' Since men to the world's end are to be saved by believing the Gospel, then there is a necessity that there should be always an order of men in the world whose business it should be to preach this Gospel: for, as St. Paul truly says, *How shall men believe*, &c. If Christ designed that the belief of his Gospel should be the way of salvation as long

that the task enjoined was to be accomplished by them alone, that task, of which, after the lapse of almost two thousand years, the greater, alas! the as the world lasts, He must certainly have designed that there should be men set apart to preach and make known this Gospel as long as the world lasts likewise. Accordingly, we find that He hath *de facto* done so; for the commission He gave to his Apostles He did really mean should extend to all those that should succeed them in that ministry, as appears plainly in the last clause of it, as I read to you out of St. Matthew, *Lo! I am with you always, even to the end of the world.* What is the meaning of that? Would He be with the Apostles till the end of the world? Why, that could not be, they were to go off the stage in a few years; and so they did: but the world hath continued many ages after their deaths, and is yet likely to continue. Christ's meaning then could be no other than this, that He would not only by his Spirit assist the Apostles in the preaching of the Gospel during their lives, but He would also continue that assistance to those that should succeed them in the work of the ministry, even so long as the world should endure; and accordingly we see that He hath hitherto made that promise good, having for above 1600 years all along continued a succession of Christ's ministers to gain souls to Christ, and all along likewise continued a succession of Christ's people in all parts of the world, who are gained to Christ by their ministry; and as He hath hitherto made good his promise, so we doubt not but He will continue to do it to the end of the world.' The words of Theophylact on Matt. xxviii. 20, are worth quoting: Οὐ μόνως δὲ τοῦτο τοῖς Ἀποστόλοις ὑπέσχετο, τὸ συνεῖναι αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶσιν αὐτοῦ ἀπλῶς τοῖς μαθηταῖς· οὐ γὰρ δήπου οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἄχρι τῆς συντελείας ἔμελλον ζῆν· καὶ ἡμῖν οὖν καὶ τοῖς μεθ' ἡμᾶς ὑπισχνεῖτο τοῦτο.

far greater part remains to be done? Strange indeed to say, it has been contended by some, in order to elude the force of this argument, that the Apostles actually accomplished their task, and carried the sound of the Gospel to the ends, not only of the old, but even the new world; and stranger still, one of the greatest divines¹ of the Calvinists

¹ I refer to Witsius, who has two very curious and amusing dissertations, the 13th and 14th, in the second vol. of his *Miscellanea*, on this subject. The notion of St. Thomas being known to the people of Brazil was started by Horne (*de Orig. Gent. Amer.* III. 19). The Brazilians are by many supposed to be of Tartarian origin, and St. Thomas is said to have preached not only in Judea but in Tartary; so that if America was peopled only at a late period, the Apostle need not have travelled so far as the New World. Then others start the idea that the Atlantis of Plato refers to America, or that, at all events, America was known to the ancients. Fuller (*Misc.* IV. 19) contends that the Phœnicians knew the compass: and they who are quite determined that Christ's command to preach the Gospel to all the world should be performed by the Apostles, cut the knot with great resolution. If the compass was not known, say they, people could go without it; and where others went, who shall doubt that Apostles would go? But if they did not go by a long sea voyage, there is nothing impossible in their going round by the North Pole: and if we cannot find out how they went, still '*fata invenerunt aut fecerunt*' a way. For if Christ performed other miracles, why should we think it strange that he sent the Apostles across the sea, and set them down in America? These resolute arguers are put down in Witsius's 14th dissertation. They indeed did not require his hand; but he has treated

has condescended, first to set this childish absurdity in the best colours his ingenuity could furnish, and then to expose it with all his vast erudition. But an objector of a different kind will complain that we rest our cause on a word ; that in the passage we allege *all* nations can only mean *all* the nations which the Apostles had the means of visiting and converting. We rest not our cause on a word, but on the promise of Jesus which explains it. ‘Lo ! I am with you alway,’ said he, ‘even to the end of the world.’ Why a promise that his assistance should be given until time was ended, if the task enjoined could be accomplished in the brief threescore years and ten, to which man’s fleeting life is bounded ? But the objectors will fly to the refuge of verbal criticism, here unfounded, and always delusive when opposed to the obvious dictates of reason ; and one will say that the *end of the world* denotes the destruction of Jerusalem ; another will confine the declaration to a promise of assiduous assistance during the lives of the Apostles¹. Was Christianity then to last only a half

the subject with that union of learning and sense which so peculiarly belongs to him, and set the command of Christ in its true light. The reader who is curious on this subject will find full references, and perhaps ample details, in Fabricius’s *Lux Evangelii*, p. 703 and foll.

¹ The first of the opinions here noticed is a common one

century, to be buried in the grave of its first teachers and forgotten? Or at best to be left like seed cast on the face of the waters, to the acceptance or rejection of a world which neither understood nor cared for it? Or, on the other hand, will it be contended, that, when our Lord thought it necessary to set apart Apostles and ministers for the care of his flock, even while the daily sight of miracles showed that the faith for which they were worked came from God, He would think no ministers necessary, when all supernatural assistance was withdrawn¹?

We must pass over many casual expressions of our Lord's, as, for example, those in which He compares Christian ministers to Rulers set over the household by the Lord, and to Shepherds ap-

among commentators of a certain school. See the Unitarian version of the N. T. Rosenmüller, &c. on Matt. xxviii. 20. The second opinion is quietly propounded by Schleusner, v. αἰῶν. The greater number of interpreters, however, have seen the good sense of the matter; and I observe, that the latest German annotator, Fritzsche, both on Matt. xxviii. 20, and on xii. 39, understands συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος as designating the second advent of Messiah in glory. See Bennet on the Rights of the Clergy, ch. i., and Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici, p. 30.

¹ Stillingfleet, Divine Right, &c. part ii. ch. xi. p. 255 (fol. ed. of his Works). See a similar argument as to the *inequality* of the ministry, in Jeremy Taylor's Episcopacy Asserted, § 1. 5.

pointed to feed his flock¹, and hasten to consider how the promises and declarations, which we have already alleged, were understood by those chosen and commissioned ministers to whom they were delivered. But one observation it seems necessary to premise. ‘These great ambassadors of Christ,’ I use the words of Bishop Hall², ‘sus-

¹ Matt. xxiv. 25 ; Luke xii. 42, 43 ; John xxi. 15—17.

² See his Episcopacy by Divine Right, part ii. § 3 (vol. ix. p. 551). So Field, (Of the Church, Book v. ch. 22,) ‘The divines doe note, that there were *foure* things proper and peculiar to the Apostles, and not communicable to any other of the ministers of Christ, appointed by Him for the gathering together of his saints. The first was, *immediate vocation*; the second, *infallibility of judgment*; the third, *generality of commission* to doe all things pertaining to the minister of salvation in all places, and towards all persons; the fourth, the speaking in all the tongues and languages of the world, the knowledge of all secrets, and power to confirme their doctrine by signs and miracles, and by the imposition of their hands, to give the like miraculous gifts of the Spirit to others. These joyntly were not communicable to any other in those times, neither Evangelists, nor Prophets, as either not being called immediately, but appointed by the Apostles; or not infallibly led into all truth: general commission they had not, but were taken into the fellowship of the Apostles’ labours, to assist their presence, and supply their absence, to build upon their foundation, and to perfect that they began. Lastly, though the having of miraculous gifts, and the power of working miracles simply, were not proper to the Apostles, yet the having of them in such sort, as by the imposition of their hands to give the Spirit, enabling to work miracles,

tained more persons than one. They comprehended in themselves the whole hierarchy, they were

and to doe miraculous things, was peculiar and proper to them ; and therefore we reade, that * Philip baptized, but that the † Apostles went to confirme them by imposition of hands that were baptized by him, that so they might receive the miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost. And as these things were reserved as proper and peculiar unto the Apostles, and not communicated to any other in their time, so are they not passed over to their after-comers by succession: but instead of immediate calling, we have now succession; instead of infallibility of judgment, the direction of their writings, guiding us to the finding out of the truth; instead of generall commission, particular assignation of several churches to rule, and parts of Christ's flock to feede; instead of miraculous gifts, and the Apostles' power to conferre them, a settled course of schooles and universities, fitting men for the worke of the Ministrie; instead of their miracles, wherewith they confirmed their doctrine, the faith already received, and by so many generations recommended unto us, as confirmed by the Apostles' miracles at the first. Neither was it fit, as ‡ Saint *Augustine* noteth, that these miraculous courses should still have continued. For even as a man that never had scene the seede cast into the earth, and their rotting; and the trees dead in winter, after reviving, and flourishing againe in their appointed time, would wonder no lesse at it, than if he should see a blind man receive sight, or a dead man life: but now that these things are ordinary, we little esteeme them, so if those miraculous things appearing in the Apostles, and first Ministers of Christ,

* Acts viii. 12.

† Ver. 17.

‡ Aug. de Utilitate Credendi, cap. xvi.

Christians, Presbyters, Bishops, Apostles. So it was, they were Apostles immediately called, miraculously gifted, infallibly guided, universally charged. Thus they had not, they could not have any successors. They were withal, Church governors, appointed by Christ to order and settle the affairs of his spiritual kingdom, and therein (beside the preaching of the Gospel and baptising, common to them with other ministers,) to ordain a succession of the great administrators of his Church. Thus they were, would be, must be succeeded.' In a word, the *office* of the Apostles was not the power of working

which with their newnesse and strangenesse moved much at the first, should have been continued still, they would have growne into contempt, and not have beene regarded at all.' In *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evang.* p. 24, we find, 'It cannot be denied but some precepts and promises given to them were of a different nature. 1. Some to the Apostles, as Apostles. 2. Some to Apostles, as Ministers. 3. Some to Apostles, as believers. If any demand, how shall we know when Christ spake to them as Apostles? when as Ministers? when as Christians? we answer that the best way to discern this, is to consider the *nature* of these precepts and promises, *i. e.* whether they are of an extraordinary nature, above what is commanded or promised to common believers or Ministers. Then these are peculiar to Apostles, as Apostles; as for example, healing the sick, &c. If they are of a nature in which all believers are concerned, as the command *to pray*, the promise of grace, these are made to the Apostles as believers. Those of a middle nature are made to them as Ministers.'

miracles, that power having been granted them to attest the Divine commission by which they were authorised to preach and perform the other parts of their office¹. Now it is to the latter part of the

¹ So Jeremy Taylor, (*Episcopacy Asserted*, § 3.) ‘This power, so delegated, was not to expire with their persons, for when the great Shepherd had reduced his wandering sheep into a fold, he would not leave them without guides to govern them, so long as the wolf might possibly prey upon them. And this he intimates in that promise, *Ero vobiscum*, &c. *Vobiscum*, not with your persons, for they died long ago, but *vobiscum et vestri similibus*, with *Apostles* to the end of the world. And therefore, that the apostolate might be successive and perpetual, Christ gave them a power of ordination, that by imposing hands on others they might impart the power they had received from Christ. For in the Apostles there was something extraordinary, something ordinary. Whatsoever was extraordinary, as “immediate mission, unlimited jurisdiction, and miraculous operations,” that was not necessary to the perpetual regiment of the Church, for then the Church should fail when these privileges extraordinary did cease. It was not, therefore, in extraordinary powers and privileges that Christ promised his perpetual assistance; not in speaking of tongues, not in doing of miracles: in these Christ did not promise perpetual assistance, for then it had been done, and still these signs should have followed them that believe, but we see they do not. It follows then, that in all the ordinary parts of power and office, Christ did promise to be with them to the end of the world; and, therefore, there must remain a power of giving faculty and capacity to persons successively, for the execution of which Christ promised perpetual assistance. For since this perpetual assistance could not be

subject that we confine our research, and without inquiring whether the Apostles imparted any mi-

meant of abiding with their persons, who in a few years were to forsake the world, it must needs be understood of their function, which either must be succeeded to, or else it was temporary in their persons. But in the extraordinary privileges of the Apostles, they had no successors, therefore of necessity must be constituted in the ordinary office of apostolity. Now what is this ordinary office? Most certainly, since the extraordinary, as is evident, was only a help for the founding and beginning, the others are such as are necessary for the perpetuating of a Church. Now, in clear evidence of sense, these offices and powers are, "preaching, baptising, consecrating, ordaining, and governing;" for these were necessary for the perpetuating of a Church: unless men could be Christians that were never christened, nourished up to life without the Eucharist, become priests without the calling of God and ordination, have their sins pardoned without absolution, be members and parts and sons of a Church whereof there is no coadunation, no authority, no governor. These the Apostles had without all question; and whatsoever they had, they had from Christ, and these were eternally necessary; these then were the *offices* of the apostolate, which Christ promised to assist for ever, and this is that which we now call the order and office of Episcopacy.'

As the nature of my argument leads me only to consider the question of a commission, and not the nature of that commission, it might be right to observe here, that the Presbyterians have endeavoured to draw an argument in favour of their form of government from Matt. xxviii. 20. Calamy (Defence of Mod. Nonconf. p. 92, 93) argues that the commission there given either enables the Apostles to ordain successors or not. If not,

raculous powers to others, we shall endeavour to show, from the records of their actions, first, that they considered themselves as possessing the right of delegating the power and gift, or commission, entrusted to them as ministers of God; and secondly, that they considered this power, gift, or commission, as the appointment of God for the continuation of the ministry, and not superseded even by a miraculous call from him.

Under the first head, it will be necessary to do little more than to recall to your minds two or three instances in which this delegation of the ministerial powers took place. It did so in the case of

it is imperfect; but if it does, then the ordaining power is comprehended under discipling, baptising, and teaching. And the same power must be conveyed with the ministerial office to all invested with it by virtue of this commission.

Hoadley (when Rector of St. Peter-le-Poor) answered this argument with great acuteness:—‘Allowing for a moment, that this was the *sole* commission under which the Apostles acted, can any one say that it is any thing more than a commission arranging that there shall always be officers for doing all that is necessary in the Church? Can any one argue that (although it makes no express difference, *i. e.* though it does not say that he who is called to teach shall not be called to ordain,) it says that every one who is called to teach shall be called to ordain?’ Besides this, it is not necessary, as Hoadley and many others observe, to suppose that the Apostles might not be instructed in many minute particulars by the Holy Spirit. See Hoadley’s Brief Defence of Episcopal Ordination, p. 137, and following.

Epaphroditus, who is said by St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Philippians¹, to have been made the Apostle of the Church amongst them. St. Jerome, in his commentary on the Galatians, expressly mentions that as one instance of the Apostles consecrating another; and Theodoret (on the passage itself) explains that his Apostleship consisted in having the spiritual government of the Philippian Church as Bishop². In the cases of Timothy and Titus again, we have a more distinct account from Scripture of the purposes for which this delegation of power took place³. The Apostles or Bishops of the Church were to ordain or lay hands on other inferior ministers, to rule the Church, not only to rebuke the laity, and reject obstinate heretics from the Church, but to receive accusations against even the priesthood, to preach the Gospel, to reprove, to rebuke, and to exhort; to do,

¹ Phil. ii. 25.

² The following are the words of Theodoret on 1 Tim. iii. 1.—
Τοὺς νῦν καλουμένους Ἐπισκόπους Ἀποστόλους ὠνόμαζον· τοῦ δὲ χρόνου προύοντος τὸ μὲν τῆς Ἀποστολῆς ὄνομα τοῖς ἀληθῶς Ἀποστόλοις κατέλειπον, τὴν δὲ τῆς Ἐπισκοπῆς προσηγορίαν τοῖς πάλαι καλουμένοις Ἀποστόλοις ἐπέθεσαν· οὕτω Φιλιππησίων Ἀπόστολος ὁ Ἐπαφρόδιτος ἦν, οὕτω Κρητῶν ὁ Τίτος καὶ Ἀσιανῶν ὁ Τιμόθεος Ἀπόστολοι, οὕτω δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν Ἱεροσολύμων τοῖς ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἔγραψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι καὶ πρεσβύτεροι.

³ See 1 Tim. iii. 1—16; iv. 12—16; v. and vi.; 2 Tim. iv. 1—6; Titus i. 4—12; ii. and iii.

in a word, the work of an evangelist, and make full proof of the ministry. Other instances might be alleged; but these obviously suffice for the formal proof of a point, which can be called in question by no one who admits the genuineness of Scripture. We proceed, therefore, to shew that the power so delegated by the Apostles was spoken of by them as a grace, or gift of God. And to this point no passage can be more remarkable than the parting address of St. Paul to certain heads of the Churches in Asia, whom he summoned to Miletus, to give them his last advice before he was carried captive to Rome¹. 'Take heed,' he says, 'unto yourselves, and to the flock whereof the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers.' Again, in those admirable Epistles to Timothy, which should be engraven on the heart of every one who is, or who is about to become a minister of God, St. Paul twice speaks of the powers vested in Timothy, through that solemn laying on of hands by which he was consecrated, as the gift or grace of God². In his first Epistle to the Corinthians³, in pointing out the various gifts bestowed by God on the early Christians, he expressly refers the appointment of ministers of the Church to God.

¹ Acts xx. 28.

² 1 Tim. iv. 14 : 2 Tim. i. 6.

³ 1 Cor. xii. 28.

‘And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers;’ while at an earlier part of the same Epistle¹ he commands that men should think of their teachers as ‘of ministers of Christ and stewards of the mysteries of God.’ Nor is the well-known passage² in the Epistle to the Ephesians less satisfactory or less conclusive on this matter. ‘And he,’ *i. e.* Christ, ‘gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ.’ It is difficult to see how any more distinct evidence could be required of the practice and opinion of the Apostolic age than the passages we have alleged. But to complete the chain of reasoning, it is necessary to show that the *gift of God* was nevertheless supposed to be conferred by human agency. Now we have noticed, in the cases already cited, that the grace was given by laying on of hands; and that the business of Timothy and Titus was in like manner to ordain or lay hands³ on Presbyters where they were

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 1.

² Ephes. iv. 11, 12.

³ In the passages to which I refer here there can be no doubt; but there is some controversy as to the meaning of the word *χειροτονέω* in the next citation, Acts xiv. 23. That it means, both in writers of the same age as St. Luke, and in some of the

required; and we may further remark, that in the Acts¹ a similar ordination of Presbyters by the

early Church writers, *to appoint*, is undoubtedly true, but it will appear also by a reference to Suicer, that both the verb and the noun were early applied to *ordination* also. That it meant a designation to the office by the Apostles, must, I think, be allowed (see Hoadley's Brief Defence of Episcopacy, ch. iii. p. 204—206); and when we remember the positive evidence existing as to the method in which that designation was made on other occasions, I hardly think we go beyond the mark in affixing to the word here a sense descriptive of that method, and certainly belonging to the word at a little later period. The great Witsius speaks with much candour on the point, though I cannot agree with him in thinking there is any reference to popular election on this occasion: scarcely a commentator, indeed, affords him any support here. After noticing the proof afforded by Suicer, that *χειροτονία* and *χειροθεσία* became equivalents in meaning, he says, “Sine dubio Apostoli potestatem Episcopos et Presbyteros creandi a Christo nacti sunt; sed prudenter censuerunt, non expedire ut omni jure suo semper uterentur. Eos potissimum Ecclesiis præfici cupiebant qui civibus suis gratissimi probatissimique erant; idcirco multum plebis ipsius arbitrio permiserunt: atque illud esse arbitror quod Lucas hic docet. Si quis pugnet convenientius videri auctoritati apostolicæ, ut et hic *χειροτονία* pro consecratione sumatur; *equidem non improbe contra tendam*; verum id certis primum argumentis addici poscam quod Apostolorum ætate vox *χειροτονία* eam significationem habuerit.” Witsius, Meletem. Leid. p. 55. In the Jus Divinum Min. Ev. p. 129, this question is very ably handled, and it is clearly shown, that whatever is the meaning of *χειροτονέω* here, it applies to Paul and Barnabas, and not to the people.

¹ Acts xiv. 23.

Apostles in all the cities of Asia is mentioned. The strongest case of all, however, is the extraordinary one of St. Paul; where, even after his miraculous conversion, we find that the Holy Spirit commanded certain ministers of the Church to separate him for the purposes of the Ministry, and that they¹, in compliance with the command, laid hands on him. Well indeed has it been observed with wonder, (and I cite the words with the more pleasure, as coming from one not disposed to exalt the powers of the Christian priesthood unreasonably,) ‘that it² was not enough to authorise Paul to preach the word, that he had been struck blind by the immediate and supernatural power of God; that the general designs of Providence had been expressly communicated to him in a vision; that Ananias had been sent to him, as a vessel chosen to bear God’s name before the Gentiles and Kings, and the children of Israel, to deliver him from his blindness!—this chosen vessel must still be consecrated “by men;” men must fast and pray over him, and lay hands on him, before he could be a legitimate preacher of the Gospel; that person must be commissioned by the instrumentality of

¹ Acts xiii. 2, 3.

² Dr. Hey, book iv. art. 23, sect. 22. This argument is insisted on with great force by the excellent Allistree, *Sermons*, vol. i. p. 209.

men, who could say of himself that he was “an Apostle, not of men, neither by men.” I cannot leave the evidence of Scripture without observing, that it is the more striking, because the notices of a Divine commission are not formally made, but occur incidentally in works devoted to other purposes. And the same observation applies to the works of the Apostolic Fathers¹, where we find that ‘they speak constantly, as if they who ministered had received a regular commission to minister²,’ and that Clement³ especially takes this commission for granted, and expressly mentions that the Apostles before their death provided for the succession of the ministry.

The argument then stands thus. We find what we conceive to be an express commission to the ministry given by Christ, we find that it was so understood by the Apostles, that they acted on it, that they ordained men to the priesthood wherever they went, and in order to provide for the extension and continuation of the ministry, gave to certain more exalted officers, in addition to the other privileges of the ministry, the same

¹ Their testimony will be found collected in Hall’s *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, sect. 10, 11.

² This is the just remark of Dr. Hey, *ubi supra*, sect. 2, who gives shortly also the testimony of the apostolic fathers.

³ See his First Epistle to the Corinthians, c. xlv. xlv.

power of ordination which they possessed themselves. We turn then to ecclesiastical history, and here we find, that in every known Church, from the very age of the Apostles to the time of the Reformation, not only has the ministry been continued, but that especial and higher class of it, the essential characteristic and distinction of which it is to confer the commission, has been continued also¹. We find too, that in no Church, from the Apostles' time to the Reformation, is an instance to be found (unless publicly reprobated and condemned), where any man has presumed to minister in the Church of God without receiving his call from the higher class of the ministry set apart for

¹ For this point perhaps the 15th and 18th—22nd sections of Hall's *Divine Right* will be sufficient. Jeremy Taylor, in the Introduction to *Episcopacy* asserted, says, 'The Catholic practice of Christendom for 1600 years is so insupportable a prejudice against the enemies of Episcopacy, that they must bring admirable evidence of Scripture, or a clear Revelation proved by miracles, or a contrary undoubted tradition apostolical for themselves, or else hope for no belief against the prescribed possession of so many ages' Thus Hooker: 'We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by Episcopal regiment, sithence the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant.'—Preface, sect. 4. For this and what follows, see also Brett on *Church Government*; Churchman's *History of Episcopacy*; and Stabyer's *Primitive Draught*.

that purpose¹. I do not allege the specific proofs of these assertions, for they are to be found in every common treatise on Episcopacy. The same

¹ The sole defender of the opposite opinion in ancient times seems to have been *Ærius*, and a reference to Epiphanius's account of him, (*Hæres.* 75,) will sufficiently show what account is to be made of his opinions. See Hall's *Episcopacy by Divine Right*, part ii. sect. 19. Jeremy Taylor's *Episcopacy Asserted*, § 47. Hall mentions also one or two instances more of persons assuming the right of teaching without ordination, and their immediate condemnation, in the 15th section. See too Taylor's *Episcopacy Asserted*, § 132. Barrow (*Vol.* iii. *Sermon* xxiv. p. 272, ed. 1686) says *, 'Of this distinction there was never in ancient times made any question, nor did it seem disputable in the Church, except to one malecontent (*Ærius*), who did indeed get a name in story, but never made much noise, or obtained any vogue in the world: very few followers he found in his heterodoxy; no great body, even of *Hereticks*, could find cause to dissent from the Church in this point†; but all *Arians*, *Macedonians*, *Novatians*, *Donatists*, &c., maintained the distinction of Ecclesiastical orders among themselves, and acknowledged the duty of the inferior clergy to their bishops: and no wonder, seeing it standeth upon so very firm and clear grounds; upon the reason of the case, upon the testimony of Holy Scripture, upon general tradition, and unquestionable monuments of antiquity, upon the common judgment and practice of the greatest saints, persons most renowned for wisdom and piety in the Church.'

With respect to Jerome's supposed depreciation of Episcopacy, the subject has been so fully and ably canvassed, that little can

* Cyp. Ep. 10—12.

† Ep. 27. 65.

arguments and instances which show the Apostolic institution and perpetual continuance of the Epis-

be necessary. See J. Taylor's *Episcopacy Asserted*, § 21. Hoadley's *Brief Defence of Episcopacy*, ch. i. p. 82—99. Bishop Hobart's *Apology for Apostolic Order*, p. 174—199. The passage occurs in the *Commentary on the Epistle to Titus*. Daubeny (*App. to Guide to the Church*, p. 48) observes, that in this place in which Jerome* says, 'that a priest is the same as a bishop,' the question is in what way this sameness is to be understood—that, from what goes before, it would seem rather that he is seeking to magnify his own office by showing the sameness of the qualifications of a priest and bishop. But putting this aside, Jerome, in order to magnify his office, is referring to the times when the words presbyter and bishop were promiscuously used. He argues this expressly from St. Paul's address to the bishops and deacons at Philippi, and observes, that there could not be more than one bishop in one city. Jerome was engaged in warm contests with bishops and deacons, who, as he thought, infringed his rights as a presbyter; and he was led, therefore, to exalt the office of presbyter as much as possible. Daubeny (*ubi supra*) remarks, that though the argument from the promiscuous use of the titles was pertinent enough to Jerome's purpose of magnifying the office of presbyter, yet that Jerome himself elsewhere shows that it has nothing to do with the cause which it is alleged to support, as, after arguing strongly in favour of the presbyter, Jerome goes on to say, that at first the Church was governed by a council of presbyters; that afterwards disputes arose, and then one chosen from the Presbyters was appointed over the rest; 'For,' he adds, 'at Alexandria, from the time of Mark the Evangelist to the present bishops,

* Jerome Ep. 85, ad Evagrium.

copal order, show at the same time the belief entertained of the necessity of that commission for the

the presbyters elected one of their own body, and named this person, placed in a higher station, bishop.' And he then subjoins, with a view to the same subject, *Quid enim facit Episcopus, excepta ordinatione, quod Presbyter non faciat* *? This important exception is enough alone to show that the opponents of Episcopacy had better not cite Jerome on their side. If he had, as Daubeney observes, before pleaded for the similarity of character between a bishop and presbyter, from the same title having, at one time, been given to both, he clearly here marks out the distinction of their office. And besides, passages in great number can be produced from other parts of his works, in which he maintains that the *supremacy* of bishops was of apostolic institution; and I think it is therefore only bare justice to him to suppose, with Hoadley and Bishop Hobart, that he meant that the change he alludes to was made in the times of the Apostles, and by their authority. 'He does not,' as Bishop Hobart observes, 'even on this supposition, pretend to adduce *any record of the fact*, but reasons only from the identity of the names bishop and presbyter.' (There is nothing in the passage *against*, but much *for* this supposition. For example,

* Jerome, ubi supra. As the word used as to the presbyters is *faciat*, Taylor (Episcopacy Asserted, § 21) argues that Jerome meant *may not*. In his day presbyters did not govern, and he could not, therefore, ask what a bishop did which a presbyter did not do likewise, but which the presbyter *could* not do? Hoadley has argued in the same way. And if this be true, it shows at once Jerome's belief that no one but a bishop *ever* could ordain.

conferring and continuance of which the order mainly exists. We have sufficient proof, then, that there has ever been in the Church a class of the Ministry instituted chiefly for the end of perpetuating the commission; and we may well ask, why it should have been so, but from the persuasion derived from the founders of the Christian Church, that in that Church, he who teaches without God's authority can be no teacher, and that the laity, or the civil magistrate, have no more power to make a priest than to institute a new Sacrament. It is true that the clergy cannot exhibit in a tangible form the seal of God to their ministry, but it is

in referring to the schisms which caused the appointment of the bishops, Jerome describes it by saying, that there was a council of presbyters until the people began to say, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos*. Surely these words look like a reference to apostolic times. Again, he says, that this change was established by a decree *through the whole world*; when could he think this could have been brought about after the Apostles' time? Stillingfleet has argued the whole matter about Jerome very ably, and to the same purpose as in the text, in his Ordination Sermon. (Works, vol. i. p. 373, fol. ed. 1710.) The probability of such a change being made *at any time* before the age of Jerome, without a single record of it, is really not worth arguing for. Jerome, in the same Epistle, says, that what Aaron and his sons, and the Levites, were in the temple, the bishops, priests, and deacons claim to be in the Church; and this, he says, he mentions, that we may know that *apostolic traditions and institutions* are taken from the Old Testament.

true also, that, if any proposition be capable of historical proof, there is an abundance of such proof, all the proof, in short, which the universal voice of history and of tradition in all ages can supply, that the Apostles of Christ never dreamt of any teachers but those called by the original authority from God¹. And it may, I think, be well to observe here, that the ground on which we have been arguing is the best ground for considering the question of episcopacy. To argue the necessity of the episcopal order merely because it is an Apostolic institution, is to argue it on very insufficient grounds, for many apostolical institutions might

¹ ‘And what the will of the Apostles was when once the Christians multiplied, and the order and regularity of the Church was to be regarded, I leave to any one to judge from the first chapter of this treatise; in which I have shown, both from the instances of ordination and rules concerning it recorded in the New Testament, and from the acknowledged testimony and practice of the first ages, that the persons manifestly designed by the Apostles for this work were ecclesiastical officers superior to Presbyters, and distinct from the laity. Nay, it is manifest, that had it been the will of the Apostles that the laity should be left to the exercise of this right, St. Paul would have given or sent orders to Ephesus, that every congregation of Christians, when it was formed, should choose one from amongst themselves for the performance of religious offices, and not have appointed Timothy to that work; the very constituting of him to ordain Presbyters being a confutation of the opinion of this author.’—Hoadley’s Brief Defence of Episcopacy, ch. iii. p. 179.

be, and doubtless were, of a temporary nature¹. But, if we think it plain from Scripture that the Apostles never contemplated the possibility of any man's becoming a minister of God without a commission, we cannot, surely, believe that that was a temporary order which was instituted by the Apostles with the power of conferring the commission, when no other order possessed the power. The same consideration goes far towards establishing the uninterrupted succession of the episcopal order; for if it can be shown that no man was admitted to minister without a commission, there must ever have existed those who had the power of bestowing it². It is on the authority of this uninterrupted succession alone³ that any one of

¹ See Appendix, No. III.

² Law's Postscript to his Second Letter, p. 71.

³ To complete the argument, it may be necessary to notice the favourite charge of the Romanists against us. They do not allow the validity of our ordinations*, but it does not seem that

* I need hardly remind my readers, that the Romanists reckon orders a *sacrament*—but as a very mean evasion has been practised lately on their part, evidently with a view to cast an effectual shade on our orders, I cannot but notice to the junior reader, that the real doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church is, that the essential *matter* of that sacrament is the *imposition of hands*. Dr. Philpotts has cited the authorities in his Letter to an English Layman, pp. 247—253.

us can presume to act as ministers of God, for if that succession had ever failed, no *earthly* power

they all of them rest their charge of *invalidity* on the same grounds. Their old argument rested on the alleged fact, that Archbishop Parker, through whom it is admitted that our Church derives her orders, was not consecrated by real Bishops.

Perhaps there is nowhere to be found a shorter and fuller refutation of this statement than in Archbishop Bramhall's Works, p. 436.—‘They say that Archbishop Parker and the rest of the Protestant Bishops in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth’s reign, or at least sundry of them, were consecrated at the Nag’s Head in Cheapside, together, by Bishop Seory alone, or by him and Bishop Barlow, without sermon, without sacrament, without solemnity, in the year 1559, (but they know not what day nor before what public notaries,) by a new phantastic form. And all this they say, on the supposed voluntary report of Mr. Neale (a single malicious spy) in private to his own party, long after the business pretended to be done.’

‘We say that Archbishop Parker was consecrated alone at Lambeth, in the church, by four Bishops, authorized thereunto by commission under the Great Seal of England, with sermon, with sacrament, with due solemnities, on the 17th day of December, anno 1559, before four of the most eminent public notaries in England, and particularly the same public notary was principal actuary both at Cardinal Pole’s consecration and Archbishop Parker’s. And that all the rest of the Bishops were consecrated at other times, some in the same month, but not upon the same day, some in the same year, but not the same month, and some the year following. And to prove the truth of our relation, and falsehood of theirs, we produce the register of the see of Canterbury, as authentic as the world hath any, the registers of the other fourteen sees then vacant, all as carefully

could have restored, what no earthly power had given¹.

But while we thus advocate the Divine right of the Ministry, while we assert that none but those who have received their commission from the hands qualified to give it, are authorized to preach the Word of God, or to administer the Sacraments, we must not be accused of the absurdity of contending for any Divine appointment in the details of Church Government. The Church, while it retains the main points, the Ministry and the Sacraments, according to the appointment of God, must, like all other societies, have the power of ordering its own government, and making such changes in minor matters, in judging, for instance, where the right of legislation, or of inflicting punishment, shall be lodged, as may appear essential from

kept by sworn officers as the records of the Vatican itself. We produce all the commissions under the Privy Seal and Great Seal of England. We produce the rolls and records of the Chancery, and if the records of the Signet office had not been unfortunately burned in King James' time, it might have been verified by them also. We produce an Act of Parliament, express to the point, within seven years after the consecration; we produce all the controverted consecrations published to the world in print anno 1572, three years before Archbishop Parker's death; whilst all things were fresh in men's memories.' For more on this point, see Appendix, No. vi.

¹ Law, *ubi supra*, p. 66.

the changes of society and of situation¹. The institution of the society as a visible body by its

¹ The truth on this matter is well stated by Bishop Hobart. ‘Episcopalians do not contend that in an extensive and unqualified sense there is any form of Church government of Divine right. Church government is often applied by episcopal writers, in a confined sense, to the orders of the ministry; and in this confined signification, Episcopal government is of Divine right: but in a more extensive sense, Church government includes the particular organization by which ecclesiastical power is exercised and discipline is administered, and the rites and ceremonies by which public worship is conducted. In this extensive signification, Episcopalians maintain that there is no precise form of Church government of Divine right: the organization of ecclesiastical authority, the forms of discipline, the rites and ceremonies of public worship, they maintain, are not laid down in Scripture, and “therefore by common consent and authority they may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people.” (Preface to American Prayer-Book.) The single point for which they contend is, that Episcopacy was instituted by Christ and his Apostles; that the three grades of ministers, bishops, priests, and deacons, with their appropriate powers, are of Divine and Apostolical institution.

‘The government of the Church, therefore, is evidently not to be identified with its ministry. The former, as including discipline, rites, and ceremonies, may be altered by human authority; the latter can only be altered by that Divine authority which originally instituted it. If we change the distinctive grades and powers of the ministry, and take the power of ordination from the hands in which it was originally vested, we make the ministry of human instead of Divine authority.

‘But

Divine Head, gives it that power, and makes its regulations obligatory on the consciences of all its

‘But while bishops, priests, and deacons, with the powers which they respectively received from Christ and his Apostles, are preserved inviolate, the Church possesses the right, according to Episcopalians, to create new officers, and to model discipline, rites, and ceremonies, as may serve best for edification, provided there be no violation of any Divine command or institution.

‘The principle that in an extensive sense there is no form of Church government *in all its parts* of Divine right, is maintained by all Episcopalians. It is particularly vindicated by the celebrated Hooker, in his learned Ecclesiastical Polity. The Puritans maintained that “God hath delivered in Scripture a complete, particular, immutable form of Church polity.” Of course they opposed the Church of England for including in her discipline and public services many things not expressly commanded by the word of God. In opposition to them, Hooker * contended, “to make new articles of faith and doctrine, no man thinketh it lawful; new laws of government, what Commonwealth or Church is there which maketh not either at one time or other?” He contends, that as external rites and ceremonies do not affect the substance of the faith, “in such things discretion may teach the Church what is convenient;” and that in regard to them “the Church is no farther tied to Scripture, than that against Scripture nothing be admitted into the Church.” Some Episcopal Churches have incorporated in their regimen many ecclesiastical officers not known in other Episcopal Churches, nor deemed essential by any. In regard to them Hooker ob-

* The Bishop refers to Hooker’s Third Book, sect. 10. I would beg to recommend the whole of that book to those who wish to understand the subject.

members and ministers. As a familiar example, we may observe, that although the commission given to a priest would *qualify* him to minister to all men, in all places, and all times, yet in this realm the wisdom of the Church has decreed, that for the sake of good order and quietness, our ministrations shall be confined to definite places, and a definite flock; and no individual can, without disregarding every call of conscience, transgress these regulations of the society to which he belongs, and under the false pretence of possessing an authority instead of a qualification, take on him the task of teaching and preaching in places and societies which belong to other men¹.

serves, “as for Deans, Prebendaries, &c. &c. and such other like names, which being not found in Holy Scripture, we have been thereby, through some men’s error, thought to allow of ecclesiastical degrees not known nor ever heard of in the better ages of former times: all these are, in truth, but titles of office—degrees of order still continuing the same they were from the first beginning.” Whatsoever things the Word of God hath neither commanded nor prohibited, the Church possesses the right, which every other society possesses, to prescribe and enjoin.

‘It is therefore a principle strictly Episcopal, received by all Churchmen, that the particular organization of Church government, matters of discipline, rites and ceremonies, are not unalterably determined in Scripture: in this extensive sense there is no particular form of Church government of Divine right.’—Apology for Apostolic Order, p. 130—132.

¹ It may be thought, at first sight, that the view here taken is

Let us now return to our former business, and inquire into the objections urged against the Divine commission. Let us inquire, first, why Reason should suggest any doubt, and any difficulty here. Is it that man is too weak, and too infirm, to do God's work in the world? But is it more difficult to believe that he should have lodged the right to speak his will with living man, infirm as he is, aided and corrected by Scripture, than that he should have committed it to Scripture alone, subject to all the corruptions, and alterations, and misconceptions, of that very human infirmity, and that very human perverseness, the effects of which appear so alarming? Or if God can give grace through the sacraments, consecrate even inanimate things to spiritual purposes, and make them the means of eternal salvation, are we to think that man alone cannot be made subservient to his designs, or effectual in attaining the ends of his grace? If, again, a Revelation be not incredible, if a Revelation must confirm the dictates of Reason as to our weakness and corruption, if it

not entirely consistent with what has been said in p. 22. The short statement which the reader will find in the Appendix will, I think, remove all appearance of inconsistency. (See Appendix, No. VII.)

¹ This is Law's argument, in nearly his words. See his Second Letter to Bishop Hoadley, p. 21. (4th edit.)

must, in order to address itself to our acceptance, offer remedies for our weakness, and cure for our corruption, why is it incredible that God, who in other cases obviously uses human agency for the effectuation of moral objects, should use it also, obviously adapted as it is for the purpose, in this highest and best of all of his dispensations?

But can any proof be alleged against us? Does Scripture declare that men shall have no authority to bless in Christ's name? Does God any where declare that it is presumptuous in man to pretend to do so, and inconsistent with his honour to bestow his graces through human hands, and that all are to be received immediately from himself? Need I remind you, that they who so think must not apply to the Old Testament at least; for there they find only the express institution of a priesthood, and the severest punishment for those who presumed to take it on themselves; there they will find a command to Aaron and his sons to bless the people, and an express promise that God's blessing should follow theirs; there they will find that God would not heal sickness, till supplication had been made by a human minister¹. But I need not proceed

¹ The substance of these arguments will be found in Law, *ubi supra*, p. 12—16.

There is an admirable passage on the Efficacy of Sacraments, in Hooker, vi. p. 177 (ed. 1661); it concludes thus:—‘God

on this ground; for assuredly they who contend against the Ministry, will never appeal to a book, which, like the Old Testament, never touches on the subject of dispute, without refuting their arguments, and negating their assertions.

✓ But the real and capital objection to the notion of a commissioned Ministry, arises, in fact, from the extent of the powers which it is supposed to claim, and which, in a corrupt Church, it did claim. Men feel a repugnance to believing that others, as infirm and as sinful as themselves, have a power to bless or to curse, to reconcile sinners to God, or to pass sentence of condemnation on them. They contend, on the one hand, that God alone can see the heart, and that by the heart alone can man be judged; on the other they urge, that the sentence must be passed by one who can be moved neither by passion nor interest; and that such a character can apply to God alone.

and man do here meet in one action upon a third, in whom, as it is the work of God to create grace, so it is his work, by the hand of the minister, to apply a sign which should betoken, and his work to annex that spirit which shall effect it. The action thereof is but one: God the author thereof, and man a co-partner by him assigned to work for, with, and under him: God the giver of grace by the outward ministry of man, so far forth as he authorizeth man to apply the sacraments of grace in the soul, whereby he alone worketh, without either instrument or co-agent.'

It would seem, indeed, (for it were idle to speak with positive certainty of the Proteus-like faith of the Roman Church, which contrives, with admirable ingenuity, to escape the firmest grasp, to elude the most entire conviction, to deny its old shape, and assume a new,) but it would seem, if we may believe some of the declarations of Bellarmine¹, that it is a doctrine of the Church of Rome, that no penitent on earth can be absolved without the Priest's sentence, that that sentence really *takes away sin*, and thus that it is necessary to salvation. But these doctrines are not to be charged on us. God only by himself forgives sin; 'who cleanses the soul from inward blemish, and looses the debt of eternal death².' We claim only a power of a

¹ Among other passages, see Bellarm. de Pœnit. iii. 2.

² These are the words of Hooker, Book vi. in the Division on Absolution (p. 173, ed. 1661). The view of absolution which follows is that which he seems to have taken. In the same division, p. 170, he says, 'To remission of sins there are two things necessary, grace, as the only bond which taketh away iniquity, and repentance, as a duty or condition required in us. To make repentance such as it should be, what doth God demand but inward sincerity joined with fit and convenient offices for that purpose, the one referred wholly to our own consciences, the other best discerned by those whom God hath appointed judges in this court. So that having first the promises of God for pardon generally unto all offenders penitent; and particularly for our own unfeigned meaning, the infallible testimony of

different kind as far as regards the eternal punishment of sin. It is our business to declare the

a good conscience; the sentence of God's appointed officer and vice-gerent to approve with impartial judgment the quality of that we have done, and as from his tribunal in that respect to assail us of any crime, I see no cause but that by the rules of our faith and religion we may rest ourselves well assured,' &c. &c.

So Jeremy Taylor:—'The priest does only minister to that pardon as he ministers to repentance. He tells us upon what conditions God does pardon, and judges best when the conditions are performed, and acts forward those conditions by his proper ministry, and ministers to us the instruments of grace; but first takes account of our souls, and helps us, who are otherwise too partial, to judge severe and righteous judgment concerning our eternal interest,' &c.—*Doctrine of Repentance*, ch. x. § 4, p. 259. Heber's ed. So Field (*of the Church*, Book v. ch. 22): 'From these bonds of sinne and punishment inflicted by God, none but hee alone can free men by his favour and the worke of his grace, as the supreme and highest cause, none but Christ by merit and satisfaction. The ministers of the Church, by the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, they convert men to God instrumentally, making them partakers of his graces, and bringing them into such an estate wherein they shall be sure for Christ's sake to finde mercie with God for the remission and taking away of their sinnes. They may pray for them, and *out of the knowledge of their estate, assure them of remission*. But other power to unloose and untie these direfull and horrible bonds of sinne and punishments, they have none.'—Farther on he notices the power of the ministry to inflict certain penances, to restrain from the sacraments, &c., to release from these penances, &c.; and then adds, 'neither is this kinde of binding

conditions on which God has been pleased to remit sin; and it is our duty, and our privilege, for the

and loosing lightly to be esteemed of, or little regarded, for he that for his contempt and disobedience is debarred from the use of the sacraments, from enjoying the society of the beleivers, and partaking in the benefit of the Church's prayers, is undoubtedly excluded from all accesse to the throne of grace in heaven, and all acceptation there; and so consequently no lesse bound in heaven than in earth; and he that is unloosed from these bonds on earth, is unloosed and set free in heaven, that without all restraint he may goe boldly to the throne of grace, to seeke helpe in the time of neede.' I would recommend the whole of that chapter to the attentive perusal of the student, especially the remarks on confession; as also the chapter on indicative absolution, at the end (p. 363) of Shepherd on the Common Prayer. I would only remark, that Shepherd, in speaking of the Nonjurors, is unjust (p. 378) if he refers to Law, when he says that the disciples of the old Nonjurors maintained that the priest had an absolute unconditional power to forgive sins. Law, I think, more than once speaks unguardedly, in talking of the necessity of absolution: but it is his express assertion, in the strongest terms, that the absolution given by man is only conditional. See especially p. 38 of the Second Letter. Scripture gives no power of unconditional absolution; and nowhere makes even authoritative absolution necessary. On the other hand, though not necessary for all, to many it may be of the greatest comfort. It is to be observed also, that when we say that it is declaratory only, we do not mean to depreciate or represent it as of no effect. It declares what? God's pardon of sin, on the supposition that the conditions he requires are fulfilled: these conditions are not matters of deep mystery, but

comfort of the penitent and returning sinner, or the timid and dispirited Christian, to declare to them, as far as fallible man can, when the conditions are fulfilled, and so to absolve them, by assuring them of God's gracious pardon in heaven to all penitents, and of his satisfaction, as far as outward tokens can warrant, with theirs.

Yet even to this limited exercise of power, the same objections, with respect to the natural imper-require only an honest and faithful heart in the priest and the penitent. When the penitent knows his own sincerity, receives the sentence of absolution from the minister, and remembers that whatsoever is rightly loosed on earth is loosed in heaven, what higher comfort can he receive on earth? 'The minister by the Word persuading them to repentance, procuring remission, and out of his prudent observation of the party's conversion unto God, assuring him that it will go well with him, as also by the sacrament instrumentally communicating to him as well the grace of repentant conversion, as of free remission (that soe we may heare the very sound and voyce of God in mercie saying to the heart and spirit of the repentant sinner, I am thy salvation), may bee said in a sort to remit sin even in that it is an offence against God, not by way of authority and power, but by winning and persuading the sinner to that conversion which obtaineth remission from God, and by the sacrament instrumentally making him partaker as well of the grace of remission of sinne from God as of conversion from sinne to God.' Field, *Of the Church*, Book v. ch. 22. Field dwelt most on the power of the minister to admit to, or reject from, the sacraments, as the power of the Keys. The whole chapter is well worthy to be studied.

fection of Priests, are urged. But be it remembered, that all the means of grace, all the ministrations of the Gospel, all hopes, all promises, all threats, whatever concerns man's salvation, is all conditional, and can only be effectual when attended by such circumstances as God requires. The agents and instruments, in short, are earthly; the being for whose sake all is done is earthly too. All is imperfect, and so all is conditional. Christianity conveys no infallible salvation; the Sacraments no infallible grace; it depends on the heart of the receiver, whether the grace they may convey be conveyed or not. They may be received by the unworthy, or the hypocrite, and thus prove a curse when they were intended to shed a blessing. And so of the power of blessing, of absolving, or condemning, given to the ministers of God. They may be deceived, because they are men; and the hypocrite may assume to them the appearance of a Christian; and they may pronounce a blessing on earth which will never be ratified in heaven. But who would thence argue, that the blessing which they pronounce, by God's leave and command, when they are not deceived, and when the ordinance has its free course, will not be ratified? Again, the Minister of God may be unworthy, and may pronounce from passion, or interest, a sentence which, in the fear of God, he would

never pronounce, and which will be overturned by God his Master. It is required that he who pronounces this absolution, he to whose earthen vessel this treasure is committed, should guard it with all the care and anxiety which so precious a deposit requires ; that he should never allow it to be polluted by any admixture of an earthly or carnal nature ; that the pure and living water should not be defiled by the turbid stream of passion or revenge, nor by the yet more sordid dregs of interest or avarice. And if these conditions be not observed, the conditional sentence is null and void ; yet its nullity, when its conditions are absent, can be no proof of its nullity when they are fulfilled.

The last point which it is necessary to bring under your notice, as immediately connected with the objection I have just noticed, and as enabling us to state in what the commission of the ministry consists, is the railing accusation often brought by vulgar and ignorant minds against the words, ‘Receive the Holy Ghost,’ used in our Ordination Service¹. The reader of Scripture need not be

¹ Another objection often taken is to the question, ‘Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost?’ &c. Secker has explained this fully in his ‘Instructions to Candidates for Orders.’ He observes that the question is not ‘Do you feel?’ but ‘Do you trust?’ *i. e.* ‘Are you on good grounds

reminded how often by *the Spirit* are expressed the ordinary, as well as extraordinary gifts of the Spirit: and, among others, that very authority and power which enables men in the Church to be ministers of holy things¹. He then who gives this power by God's permission and command, may justly use the phrase we speak of, and feel assured, that he bestows such power as Christ has endowed his Church withal; such power as, in the words of Hooker², neither Prince nor Potentate, King nor Cæsar, on earth can give. For as the object for which the Ministry is instituted is to carry on the dispensation of grace, which has been the great object of God's providence ever since this lower world was created, which his

persuaded?' And as the Archbishop observes, 'the way to know this, is by first seeing whether the Spirit has moved you to live *soberly, righteously, and godly*, not to transgress nor omit any duty wilfully, to have a practical faith in Christ, and on the terms of the Gospel covenant has given you a title to everlasting life. But farther, has he given you a desire *to serve God*, for the promoting of his glory and the edifying the Church? Are these your motives, and do you believe yourself qualified to execute the office? *Then* you may answer in the affirmative, for we can have such trust to Godward only through Christ, who hath sent us the Spirit.'

¹ Thus especially Bishop Hopkins on the 5th Commandment, Works, p. 181, fol. ed.

² Hooker, Book v. § 76.

wisdom had decreed before its foundations were laid, for which the Son of God was incarnate and crucified, and the gifts of the Spirit were spread abroad on mankind; as, in short, it is our business¹ to preach the saving truths of the everlasting Gospel, to declare the conditions of pardon, to offer the means of grace in the Sacraments, to comfort the penitent with the assurance of forgiveness, and by every method which zeal and piety can suggest, to procure the salvation of souls, so we may be assured that that Master who lays the burthen of the ministry on us by those words, by those words so connects himself with it, that we shall assuredly receive from him the assistance, ‘the aid, the countenance, and support we require in all that we faithfully undertake in the discharge of our office. Knowing, therefore, that when we receive ordination, we receive also the present assistance of the Spirit, partly to guide, direct, and strengthen us in all our ways, and partly to assume to *itself* the actions which belong to our place and calling, in order to confer a higher authority on them; can we either hear the words at the solemn hour of our admission to the Ministry, or recall them to our minds and reflections, without a strong and triumphant feeling

¹ The whole of this passage is Hooker’s, *ubi supra*, though the phrases are here and there modernized.

of exultation and joy? Remove what these insulted words imply, and what have we wherein to glory? But now since that blessed Spirit, which our Saviour gave at his first calling of mankind to his ministry, concurs with spiritual vocations through all ages, we have for the very least of our duties that to dignify, to grace, and to authorize them, which no other officers on earth can challenge. Whether we preach, pray, baptize, communicate, declare God's wrath or his forgiveness, as stewards of God's mysteries, our words, our judgments, and our deeds may, while our hearts and hands are holy, be guided by him, and so be his, rather than ours.' A truth so solemn and so awful, that if it were unfeignedly believed, the Church of God would ever be what it ought to be, without spot or blemish of neglect or sin. For who would carelessly bestow, who idly use, who lightly value, the gifts and graces of the Spirit of God?

May God grant to such of you, my younger brethren, as are about to enter into his service, the spirit of wisdom. May he possess your minds with just and elevated views of the privileges and gifts he bestows on his Ministers, and thus prepare you for the awful duties, the serious responsibility, the anxiety, the toil, the difficulty of your office,

that so having done your share in the perfecting of the Saints, the edifying the body of Christ, ye may finish your course with joy, and enter into your Master's rest.

SERMON III.

MALACHI ii. 7.

The Priest's lips should keep knowledge, and they should seek the law at his mouth; for he is the messenger of the Lord of Hosts.

I HAVE endeavoured, in the preceding discourses, to set before you the proofs ever deemed satisfactory, by those who recognize the truth of the Scriptures, that God has been pleased to institute a ministry in his Church, and to give it the sanction of his authority, and the promise of his assistance. Let us proceed to inquire, how the facts which we have established ought to operate on those who either are, or are about to become, public teachers, under the authority so given. The great consideration which addresses itself to their notice is this; that God, who has chosen to work by human agents, knows their strength, as well as their infirmity; their capacity, as well as their imperfections; and that, while, of his goodness, he will pardon, as well as supply, the inevitable wants and

deficiencies of his chosen agents, he still, in the knowledge of their natural powers, and of the effects they are capable of producing, requires and expects the exertion of those powers to their full extent. To say, indeed, that God works by human means, is only to say, that he intends those means to effect all that they have the power of effecting.

In the dispensation of the Gospel, then, he who is called to the work is to feel this awful truth pressed on his conscience, that whatsoever his hand findeth to do, whatsoever his natural gifts, whatsoever the advantages already acquired, or still within his reach, will enable him to perform, that he is to perform with all his might. For he has no longer the promise of that extraordinary assistance which attended the first chosen preachers of the Gospel; his work is to be done by the gentler influences of the Spirit, working with his natural or acquired gifts. He is therefore bound, by every tie of conscience, to extend and enlarge his faculties, and to use them when so extended and enlarged to the promotion of that service to which he is called. Our subject then naturally divides itself into a consideration of the means to be used by the teacher, to qualify himself for the discharge of the duties expected from him, and of his practice of the duties themselves. We shall devote ourselves to-day to the first of these con-

siderations, and endeavour to show you the solemn obligations of the minister of God to thought and study, as indispensable means of qualifying himself for the discharge of his duties. I shall urge the obligation by setting before you the difficulties of the task, the knowledge necessarily required, and the mischiefs necessarily attendant on an incompetent share of it. I enter on this subject the more anxiously, first, because in some works on the pastoral office, very justly recommended to your notice, the necessity of patient and continued study is not, I think, duly appreciated¹; a remark which

¹ Burnet's Pastoral Care, for example, is full of passages tending to depreciate human learning. It is true that Burnet's professed intention is to establish the *superiority* of piety as a qualification for the ministry. But I cannot believe this view of the case to be either just or expedient, especially in the present day, when we have so much real zeal in many ministers, which might have produced far happier fruit if tempered by the discretion naturally resulting from patient study and sound learning. Why should we make even the semblance of an opposition between piety and learning, or extol one at the expense of the other? Is there, in fact, any necessary opposition between them? Let the works of Taylor, and Hall, and Bull, and Pearson, and Barrow answer. Let me earnestly request the reader to consult the Appendix, No. VIII., for the opinions of some of our most eminent men on this subject.

If then learning has no tendency to quench piety, let me ask whether the advantage of human learning towards understanding Scripture, and gaining clear views of the doctrines taught in it,

it would not become me to make, were not the opposite view which I urge on you sanctioned by

will be denied? If that point too is conceded, as it must be, what excuse can be alleged for the minister's neglecting that which can give him any, the least, vantage ground, and far more, that which will give him so great a one in the exercise of his duty?

It is really distressing to hear the idle answers to these arguments. It is commonly said that great learning can be of no use in a country parish, where the people are ignorant and require only plain instruction. They who so speak must imagine that the only use of learning is to enable its possessors to quote Hebrew and Greek in the pulpit. Let such reasoners be assured that the advocates for learning recommend it, not that the eyes of the vulgar may be dazzled, but because they believe it to be one of the best means, under God's blessing, of attaining sound and just views of the many great and awful subjects within the province of the divine, both directly by making him acquainted with the writings of men wiser than himself, and indirectly by calling on him to exercise his faculties.

Bishop Jebb has stated the great purpose for which the divine is required to engage in theological study most admirably,—‘It is that we may save ourselves and them who hear us; it is that we may be ourselves more firmly established in the great principles of our faith; and that hence we may be enabled wisely, faithfully, scripturally, and devoutly to feed our several flocks with the words of eternal life.’—Jebb's Sermons, p. 327. How many separations from the Church, how much tendency to schism within it indeed would have been spared, had many well-intentioned ministers of late days added to their right intentions that sound knowledge and learning without which such intentions are often fruitless and often mischievous! When we hear from

some of the greatest of our divines, men as much distinguished by the fervour of their zeal and the activity of their exertions, as by the depth and

some of them the declaration that no knowledge but that of Scripture is required, it is impossible not to call to mind the two first clauses of the caustic phrase of Prideaux:—‘*Bonus textualis, bonus Theologus, clamant quam plurimi, qui nec de textu, nec de Theologia, nec de bonitate sunt solliciti.*’ It is indeed enough to know Scripture, but that knowledge is not perfected by the soundest learning and the longest life. Bishop Jebb, after enumerating the variety of matter and of style in Scripture, adds, ‘When it is soberly considered that all this is contained in that wonderful book the Bible, and that the Bible itself is but a text-book expanded by the ablest writers and the best men, who have in all ages edified the Church; then let us honestly pronounce, whether Christian teachers have not a field of mental exertion which rather astonishes by its magnitude than circumscribes by any rigorous and dispiriting limitation.’—Jebb’s *Sermons*, p. 294.

To a different class of persons the inculcation of the necessity of learning is equally necessary. General and superficial information is diffused in so many shapes, and is to be obtained at so easy a rate, that there is an ‘ignorant impatience’ of severe study. But such is the extent of theology, and such the difficulties of many branches of it, that nothing but ‘applying ourselves wholly to this one thing, and drawing all our cares and studies this way,’ nothing but being really ‘diligent in such studies as help to a knowledge’ of Scripture, will make us what we ought to be, will enable us ‘rightly to divide the word of God,’ and to bestow that knowledge which the laity have a right to seek at our mouth.

solidity of their learning¹. But I am the more anxious on the subject, because I fear we pass not too harsh a censure on many who enter the Church if we say, that they consider the slight preparation, which alone can be made previously to ordination, as the only preparation that is necessary, and that they deem the qualification thus acquired sufficient, as far as study goes, to render them able ministers of the New Testament².

Let it not be thought, on the other hand, that I seek to represent learning as the only, or even as

¹ See Appendix, No. VIII.

² ‘Giving instruction requires knowledge; and therefore as a competent degree of it is justly expected of persons before they enter into holy orders; so when they enter, the care of making a continual progress in it is solemnly promised by them, and covenanted for with them. What may be a very good beginning, is by no means a sufficient stock to go on with; and even that will lessen, if no pains be taken to increase it. Continued application then is a duty of importance. Persons of lower abilities and attainments are in danger, without it, of being useless and despised; and they, who set out with greater advantages, are bound to endeavour at doing, in proportion, greater services to the Church of God. Without exception, therefore, all who are engaged in so serious an employment as ours, if they have any regard either to their duty or their character, must take care not to be more remarkable for their diversions than their studies; nor indolently to trifle their time away, instead of employing it to good purposes.’—Archbishop Secker’s First Charge, p. 13 (5th edition).

the *first* qualification of a Christian teacher ¹. The *first* qualification of such a teacher, is, beyond all

¹ I do not know whether the Quakers as a body, or the expositor of their opinions, Mr. Clarkson, is entitled to the credit of the reasoning produced in the following passage: 'They' (the Quakers) 'believe that if a knowledge of Christianity had been attainable by the acquisition of the Greek and Roman languages, and through the medium of the Greek and Roman philosophers, the Greeks and Romans themselves had been the best proficient in it.' — Clarkson's Portraiture of Quakerism, Vol. ii. p. 249. (3rd edit.) Does Mr. Clarkson, or do the Quakers, believe that there is any Christian sect which maintains that Christianity is attained by learning Greek and Latin, and studying the Greek and Latin writers? We may, I think, fairly call on them to tell us where and when this sect arose. This is the way in which Christians learn to conceive evil thoughts of one another. They assume a knowledge of others' opinions which they do not possess, and then set themselves to oppose the creatures of their own fancy. In the present instance one can hardly believe that such a sentence could be written *upon reflection*.

But the following reasons alleged by Mr. Clarkson, on the Quakers' part, against a ministry, appear to me almost as singular. None must exercise the ministry but such as are called by the Spirit, who always will call a succession. None must be intended by his parents for the ministry, *because* 'the wind bloweth, &c.' Laying on of hands can do no good, *because* it cannot give the spiritual gifts of God. Human learning cannot be essential, *for* the human mind cannot penetrate into divine things, and illiterate men appear to have more knowledge on such matters than the most learned, &c.

The use of the words *for* and *because* in the above passages is at least remarkable.

controversy, a fervent spirit of love to God and to man. In that love the foundation of all ministerial usefulness must be laid¹; and without it, all the learning and all the eloquence, ever possessed by man, will be vain and unprofitable. Neither let it be forgotten that, before all things, it is necessary that a minister of God should look to *prayer* for his sufficiency in his work. ‘Of this too,’ says a great prelate, ‘we are put in mind at our ordination, and therefore should never forget it. For in that admirable exhortation which goes

¹ ‘Our Saviour teaches us that this is the principle by which his ministers ought to act, in the question which he asks St. Peter, and repeats it thrice after his resurrection, “Simon Peter, lovest thou me?” and in the command which follows on his profession that he loved him, “Feed my lambs, and feed my sheep,” take care of the souls of young and old, that they want not their proper food. For they are so dear to him (as Theophylact there notes), that he makes our care of them to be the mark of our affection to him! For it is therefore a certain token of our love to him, because it flows from thence as from its fountain and spring. If we love *him*, we can never neglect *them*. This will make us studious and industrious to promote the salvation of those souls whom Christ so dearly loved, it being the truest expression of our love to Christ. So Chrysostom upon this place: “Christ repeated this so often, to show us after what manner we ought chiefly to love him, by taking care of his flock.” Can any man read this, then, and be negligent? No, not if he love the Lord Jesus in sincerity, who hath bid him demonstrate his love “by feeding his lambs and his sheep.”’—Bishop Patrick’s Work of the Ministry, p. 96—98.

before the questions to which we are to make answers, the great excellence and great difficulty of our office is represented to us ; to make us sensible what need we have to pray earnestly for God's Holy Spirit ;' without which it is impossible for us to have either a will or ability to perform it as we ought. And accordingly this is one of the things which immediately follows, after we promise to God and his Church, that we will ' be diligent in prayers as well as in reading the Holy Scriptures '¹.

¹ Bishop Patrick's *Work of the Ministry*, p. 15. The same admirable person adds, ' To be strangers to this holy duty (of prayer) is to be strangers to God, and to all that is good ; who, as he is nigh to all those that call upon him faithfully, so he withdraws himself from those who neglect him ; of which we cannot be guilty if we remember in what need we stand above all other men of his blessed presence with us, to guide and strengthen, and further us in the discharge of our weighty trust, for his honour and the salvation of men. This will stir us up not only to ask and seek, but knock also, (as our Saviour speaks,) that is, pray with the greatest importunity for the Holy Spirit. His grace and mercy we ought to seek as soon as we rise, and as often as we can in the day, retiring ourselves into our closets, to beseech him to be with us in our study and in our labours, for the good of souls. For, as Clem. Alexandrinus speaks, (*Strom. Lib. viii.*,) a priest ought to be of such a heavenly spirit, that " his whole life is prayer and conversation with God." Employ, therefore, as much time as you can in secret prayer to God, with such affection that you may feel yourselves really bettered by it. Pray for yourselves and pray for the flock (that God would bless your labours among them, and pour the heavenly dew of

But I seek to impress upon those, who, under the influence of a spirit of love, and in a deep conviction of the necessity and the privilege of prayer, are about to become ministers of God, that they are bound to aim at the possession of every acquirement by which they can promote the cause of their Master. I desire to show those who are about to enter the ministry with a careless and indolent mind, that the knowledge necessary to every minister who is not a disgrace to his order, will require a long-continued and patient course of study,—a consideration, by which I would fain hope that they may be either roused from their fatal lethargy, or moved from their evil purpose.

Let us then consider the young minister as having received that call which is to devote him to the service of God. As far as any thing external and without himself is concerned, nothing more can be done, nothing more is to be done on earth, to enable him to obey the call he has received. But because nothing more without himself is required, it is a fatal error on his part to think himself therefore fully qualified for his office, and to dream that his own task of preparation is accomplished. True, he has received the commission which makes him an ambassador for God; he may enter on that

his grace upon them), for the whole Church of Christ, yea, for all mankind.’—*Ibid.* p. 17. 19. 21.

awful task of conveying the tokens of reconciled justice and atoning love to the sinner; he may stand by the dying bed and promise mercy or threaten woe, he may be for the people to Godward, and where the Christian heart is filled with hope and joy in believing, the Master, who has promised to be with his Church to the end of the world, will not allow the unworthiness of the minister to destroy the efficacy of the sacrament, but will make the means of grace effectual and the hope of glory sure¹. But in the flock committed

¹ I shall not, I trust, be thought wanting in respect to Jeremy Taylor, in expressing my regret that the contrary opinion is delivered, and so strongly, in his works. ‘Although it be true, that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend wholly upon the worthiness of him that ministers, yet it is as true that it does not wholly rely upon the worthiness of the receiver; but both together relying on the goodness of God, produce all those blessings which are designed. The minister hath an influence unto the effect, and does very much towards it.’—Consecration Sermon, Works, Vol. vi. p. 316.

Again, ‘What good shall the people receive when the Bishop lays upon their heads a covetous or a cruel, an unjust or an impure hand?’—Ibid. p. 317.

In the Sermon called ‘The Minister’s Duty in Life and Doctrine,’ Vol. vi. p. 500, he holds the same opinions, and asks, ‘Can he minister the Spirit from whom the Spirit of God is departed?’ But the consequences of his doctrine seem to have struck him so forcibly that he there tempers it, and allows that no man will be lost but by his own fault; still, however, maintaining that God will not send the Spirit by the ministrations of

to the young minister, how few are thus prepared for that part of the work of the Church, how many

an evil man, but by some extraordinary way. How far more reasonable is the opinion of our Church, as set forth in her 20th Article, and how beautifully has Leighton expressed this in the following passage :—‘What he can extraordinarily do who doth alway what he wills in heaven and earth, we question not. He can convey grace by those to whom he gives none. He can cause them to carry this treasure, and have no share in it ; carry the letter, and not know what is in it ; and make them, so to speak, equivocal causes of conversion.’—Leighton’s Works, Vol. iii. p. 472, Jerment’s edit.

The word extraordinarily, however, is inapplicable : ‘Christ’s promises,’ says Beveridge, ‘were not made to the administration of the ordinance by faithful persons, but to the ordinances in general, as duly administered even by such as are truly and rightly called to it. Be the minister worthy or unworthy, if I come with faith to an ordinance, I am sure to go with grace from it.’—Beveridge’s Works, Vol. ix. p. 472.

‘I deny not,’ says Fuller, with his usual quaintness, ‘but dissolute men, like unskilful horsemen which open a gate on the wrong side, may, by the virtue of their office, open heaven for others and shut themselves out.’—Holy State, Book ii. ch. ix. ‘God may feed his people as he did Elijah, by a raven, and make a cold breath kindle the sparks of grace in the hearts of others, and blow it up into a flame.’—Bishop Hopkins on the Fifth Commandment, Works, p. 180, fol. edit.

No one has given stronger testimony on this point than Isidore Pelusiot, as, for example, I. 120.—‘*Εἰ τις ἁμαρτίαις ἀπόστροφος, πᾶσι κατεστιγμένος μολυσμοῖς τε καὶ πταιίσμασι, θυσιαστηρίων ἄπτεται Θεοῦ, καὶ χειρίζει ἀνάγνως τὰ ἅγια, αὐτὸς μὲν ὑφέξει κρίμα, τὸ δὲ θεῖον βῆμα ταῖς ἐκείνου πράξεσιν οὐ κοινοῦται.*’ See

are lost in the gulf of indifference, or in the deeper gulf of sin! How shall he rouse the one, and reclaim the other? Where shall he find a voice that shall speak to the sinner's heart, or strike on the dull cold ear of careless sensuality? This is, indeed, the work which he is called on to do, and the instruments for performing it are placed in his hand, if he has the skill to use them. What could God, while he works by human agents, do more? what which he hath not done? 'God will exert his action, but in concurrence only with the teacher exerting his¹.' His grace will go with the minister, but will not force him on, who cannot, or will not go by himself. The means of grace, the seal of pardon, the sure promises, are all entrusted also II. 37, III. 340. So Euseb. ap. J. Damasc. Sacr. Parall. 29. T. ii. p. 666. 'Πολλοὶ ἁμαρτωλοὶ πρεσβύτεροι ὄντες προσφέρουσιν, καὶ οὐκ ἀποστρέφεται ὁ Θεός, ἀλλὰ τῷ πνεύματι ἁγίῳ ἁγιάζει τὰ προσκείμενα ἑῷρα.'

Taylor's doctrine (which is, in fact, maintained by the Quakers and others,) is very dangerous on this simple ground, that as *worthiness* and *unworthiness* are relative terms, it never could be certain whose ministry men were to attend if this doctrine were true.—See Bennet on Quakerism, ch. xv. p. 195.

What I have said in the text will be sufficient to prove that I am here only seeking to show that the believer will not suffer in real benefit by the unworthiness of his minister; he will suffer in comfort; and the sinner who cannot profit by the ordinances may be left to perish.

¹ South, Vol. iv. Sermon i. p. 32.

to his keeping ; but how shall he reach them forth to them who have no desire to receive them, if he himself, the Lord helping him, cannot inspire them with that desire ? And how shall he be able to do that holy work, if he be neither able to teach nor willing to learn ?

But able to teach, except in a limited degree, at that age, and with such brief time for preparation, he cannot be. For it is a great work, and a perilous office. The priest's office lies among mankind, and his object is their liberation from sin, and from its penalty. But he who desires to dissuade men from vices, must lay his general foundation, indeed, in the evil nature and consequences of sin, but must rest his peculiar dissuasive very much on the peculiar temper of individuals. He must study their dispositions, and in the countless variety which presents itself, he is to be able to deal with all ; to judge when the threat of vengeance¹ is to be

¹ ‘ We must preach,’ says Bishop Reynolds, ‘ with courage and boldness, not fearing the faces of any presumptuous sinners, who dare to affront the law, and not to fear the face of God. Shall any man be so bold as to do what God forbids ? and shall a minister be so timorous as not to speak what God commands ? Shall I be afraid to offend him by doing my duty, who is not afraid to offend God by neglecting his ? Shall I be afraid to save him, who is not afraid to destroy himself, or shall I be dismayed at the face and frown of a man, and neglect the wrath of God, who can tear me in pieces ? “ Be not dismayed at their

held forth, and when the hope of mercy proffered ; what hearts require the fear of the law, and what will be softened by the gentle voice of the gospel ; he is to deal with the careful and the careless, to inspire into the timid all the uncompromising firmness of the Christian law, into the violent all its gentleness and love ; to purify the grossness of earthly passion in the sensualist, and to awaken the fervour of heavenly love in the cold and heartless disciple of the world¹. He must condescend

face, saith the Lord, lest I confound thee before them." (Jer. i. 17.) Yet this boldness must be in a way of conviction and persuasion, without indiscretion and exasperation ; that when we show our zeal against men's sins, we may withal manifest our love to their persons, and that honour and reverend esteem which we owe to their dignities and conditions.' Sermon. xxiii. Works, Vol. v. p. 349. And again, 'A preacher, as a surgeon, should have an eagle's eye to discover the state of the soul, a lion's heart to search spiritual wounds, and a lady's hand to dress them with tenderness and sympathy.' Sermon. xxv. Vol. v. p. 402.

¹ 'Our part is, therefore, constantly to be intent upon our ministry, and frequent and zealous in performing the several duties of it ; to instruct the ignorant with plainness, to rectify the erroneous with temper ; to rebuke the obstinate with authority, and to punish the incorrigible with resolution.'—Bishop Hough, Charge iii. p. 61.

This point, indeed, has been insisted on by many writers, but by none with more effect than by the heavenly-minded Leighton, in his exquisite 'Sermon to the Clergy.' His words are as

to ignorance, and compassionate infirmity ; he must be wise with the wise, and weak with the weak ; in

follows : ‘ The second requisite of these ambassadors, is prudence, or dexterity to manage their Master’s business. Wise princes and states, in choosing their ambassadors, above all other kinds of learning, have respect to practical abilities ; and they that can best read the several geniuses and dispositions of several nations and particular men, and accordingly know how to treat with every one according to their temper, to speak to them in their own language, are judged the fittest men for that employment. Great is the diversity of humours among men ; some are timorous, some rash, some avaricious, some ambitious, some slow and leaden, others precipitant and mercurial, and many other varieties. Now to know how to deal with each of these in their own kind, for the advancement of his Master’s business, is a special discretion in an ambassador. And those ambassadors we speak of had as much need of it as any : they have men of all, both outward and inward differences, to deal with, and the same men so different from themselves at divers times, that they are hardly the same ; some ignorant, others learned, some weak, others strong, some secure with false presumptions, others tormented with false fears. And much prudent consideration of those differences, and accommodating themselves thereunto in the matter and manner of their discourses, is very expedient in their treaties. “ Of some have compassion, plucking them out of the fire, making a difference.” Jude 22. What other is St. Paul’s “ becoming all things to all men, that he might win some ? ” 1 Cor. ix. 22. And this policy is far different from temporizing, and compliance with evil, which in no case can be tolerated in these ambassadors ; for that is disadvantageous to their business : it may be the way of their own promotion, but it is not the way to advance their Master’s king-

a word, he must be all things to all men. For his is the hardest of all tasks : to counteract prejudice, and subdue passion ; to make men resign the present gratification of their fondest wishes, for distant and future expectations ; and to teach them that truth which at first they are unable, and ever continue unwilling to believe¹. My brethren, who is

dom, which end should be the square of all their contrivances, and with it nothing will suit but what is upright. A kind of guile they may use, but it must carry the King's impress ; it must be a holy guile : and such the ministers of the Gospel not only may, but ought to study. Fishers of men they are, and why may they not use certain baits, and diversity of them ? But as their catching is not destructive, but saving, so must all their baits be : they must quarter dove-like simplicity and serpentine wisdom together, as he commanded them, who sent them on this embassy.'—Leighton's Works, Vol. iii. pp. 474, 475. Jerment's edit.

'Neque enim mediocris virtus sacerdotalis est, cui cavendum non solum ne gravioribus flagitiis sit affinis, sed ne minimis quidem ; ut sit promptus ad misericordiam, promissum non remordeat, lapsum revocet, compatiatur dolori, mansuetudinem teneat, pietatem diligat, iram repellat vel decoquat ; sit quidem lituus plebis excitandæ ad devotionem, mitificandæ ad tranquillitatem.'—S. Ambros. Ep. Class I. Opp. T. ii. p. 1036, ed. Bened.

I would refer too to Bull's admirable remarks on the prudence necessary to the divine.—Some Points, &c. I. 249—254.

¹ 'It is no small work whereby strong holds must be pulled down, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the kingdom of God be demolished ; whereby sin and Satan must be

sufficient for these things? I ask you if these powers can be acquired by him who does not strictly and fully comply with the Apostle's charge, to meditate on these things¹, and give himself

dispossessed, and the whole man subdued to the obedience of Christ; whereby the very natural propensions of men must be changed, and they effectually persuaded to hate what they loved, to love what they hated; to deny themselves, their reason, their will, their appetites, their interests, their lands, their relations, their lives, their all (for this they must sometimes do '*quoad exercitium*,' ever '*quoad præparationem animi*'), to please an invisible God, and to obtain an invisible inheritance. This is not the work of an illiterate reader, but of one who hath the tongue of the learned, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed. This is not the work of a careless loiterer, that shears the fleece, and starves the flock, but of one who gives himself wholly to it.'—Bishop Reynolds, Sermon xxiii. Works, Vol. v. p. 34 (ed. 1826).

¹ Bishop Jebb, after noticing the meaning of *μελετάω*, as applied to military matters, oratory, games, &c. proceeds thus to say, that with moral writers, both profane and sacred, it has a meaning quite analogous to the former two—denoting, among other things, a thoughtful investigation of goodness and virtue flowing from a deep interest in them, and leading to exemplary practice—the looking forward to probable trials of our virtue—comparison of means with ends, duties with power—the consideration of the several parts of duty, and the continued moral recollection of the several relations in which we stand. He then proceeds thus: 'The practical meditation thus inculcated is in a peculiar and paramount degree the duty of all Christian Ministers. For they are to watch, and give account, not only

wholly to them? I ask you if any share of them will be gained by him who considers his task done

for their own souls, but for the souls of others. Ordinary men may meditate ; and by meditating, may forecast, within a narrow compass, the whole circle of their own duty. But the clergyman has need to be prepared for all the contingencies that may happen to all men. His range of necessary thought is co-extended with the wants, the weaknesses, the pursuits, the occupations, the doubts, the difficulties, the perversities, the scruples of the whole flock of Christ. He is not at liberty to account any one human concern foreign from his affection and his care. With him it rests, to warn the unruly, to comfort the feeble-minded, to support the weak, and be patient unto all. These offices, which angels might covet, to us it is given to fulfil ; and we shall find it utterly impracticable to fulfil them, I will not say as we ought, but to discharge them in any tolerable degree, without constant, devout, and humble meditation. One consideration has occurred to me on this matter, which I will lay before you, with all plainness. We are each of us enjoined by a Rubric of our Church, when we give warning for the celebration of the Holy Communion, to read a very solemn exhortation to the people ; and at the close of this exhortation we each of us invite all, who cannot quiet their own consciences, and who may require further comfort and counsel, to come unto us, and open their grief, that they may receive spiritual counsel and advice to the quieting of their consciences, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness. How others may be affected by this consideration, it is not for me to conjecture. But this I will say, in all simplicity and seriousness, that I cannot pronounce this exhortation without fear and trembling ; and that clergymen who reflect at all, might well sink under such a burthen, if they did not possess the resource of Christian medi-

when holy hands have been laid upon him, and who neglects to stir up the gift which was given by their imposition? I ask you if his youth will not be despised, and if it does not deserve to be so?

These difficulties, however, which I have enumerated, are to be avoided, these qualifications I have spoken of are to be gained, by careful examination of our own characters, and those of other men, by patient thought, and reflection, and prayer, rather than by study. But the careful study of other men's characters, and the earnest and diligent examination and correction of our own, are not enough; these are the *means* only by which we are to enable ourselves to fulfil our task, and to teach the truth committed to us when we have learned it ourselves. For be it remembered that we are not to teach our own wisdom, nor be guided by our own knowledge; that we are to teach Christianity, and that only, and that before we can teach, we must learn¹.

tation; and if a very important branch of this meditation were not most devout and fervent prayer, for the preventing and assisting grace of God's Holy Spirit.'—Funeral Sermon on Archbishop Brodrick. (Practical Theology, ii. 187.)

¹ The matter of this our preaching is, in general, the 'whole counsel of God,' 'all the words of life,' 'that which we have heard from the Lord of Hosts.'—We are 'angels,' we must keep to our message; we are ambassadors, we must keep to our commission; we are depositaries, we must discharge our

It is said, indeed, in reply, that Christianity is so simple, that it can require little learning; that Christian truth amounts to this only, that we are to be holy here, in order that we may be happy hereafter. But it is a gross fallacy to infer the simplicity of a proposition, from the simplicity with which it can be stated, and to lay out of the account the wide and difficult considerations which it may involve¹. Are we to be treated for ever like children of a larger growth, and to be restrained from a knowledge of those truths which Scripture itself sets before us? Are we to forget that every man who knows any thing, knows that holiness is required of him, yet that of himself he cannot be holy, and that, therefore, in that

trust. ‘*Quid est depositum?*’ saith Vincentius Lirinensis, speaking of the command to Timothy (1 Tim. vi. 20): ‘*Id quod tibi creditum est, non quod a te inventum; quod accepisti, non quod excogitasti; rem non ingenii, sed doctrinæ; non usurpationis privatæ, sed publicæ conditionis, in qua non auctor debes esse, sed custos.*’ And so Origen: ‘The apostle,’ saith he, ‘hath given example to the doctors of the Church, to speak to the people, non propriis præsumpta sentiis, sed divinis munita testimoniis.’ ‘Our own devices are all but chaff; God’s word is the wheat (Jer. xxiii. 28); ours, but hay and stubble; his, gold, and silver, and precious stones.’ Bishop Reynolds, Sermon xxv. Works, Vol. v. p. 399 (ed. 1826).

¹ This point is argued in a masterly manner by Mr. Coleridge, in his second Lay Sermon, p. 54—61.

requirement is implied and involved at once an opening of the whole scheme of redemption, decreed from the beginning, foretold in Prophecy, prefigured in the Law? Is this to be received without inquiring into its grounds, or examining the evidence for its truth? But such an inquiry is hopeless for a large body of mankind, though a knowledge of its results is indispensable. The inquiry itself must be made for them. And here is the first part of the teacher's task. He must set before the people the nature of the faith required, the practice enjoined, the salvation proffered. But who that remembers the extent and the difficulty of the subjects involved, the consideration of God as a moral Governor, the vindication of his ways to man, the nature and the consequences of his attributes, the existence and extent of the corruption of man's moral being, and the nature of the remedy provided, who, I say, will tell us that these things are easy? Who that remembers that now we see through a glass darkly, and remembers too the propensity of our poor nature to be for ever dazzled by false lights, ever misled by fancy, and ever seduced into partial views of truth,—who that knows the dangers of error to ourselves and others, will bid us go 'sounding on our dim and perilous way¹,' without

¹ Wordsworth's Excursion.

every assistance which the wisdom and knowledge of other, and earlier, and wiser men, can bestow¹?

But alas! it is little to avoid error ourselves, we are bound to correct it in others; bound by our duty to God, and to those whom He has committed to our charge. Well, indeed, has it been said, that in these days our fate is like that of the rebuilders of Jerusalem; with one of their hands they were to work in the building, with the other to hold a weapon of defence². Look, then, I

¹ ‘Because it is not to be expected that every minister of the word should have all the gifts of the Spirit, and every one to abound in tongues, in doctrines, and interpretations; you may, therefore, make great use of the labours of those worthy persons, whom God hath made to be lights in the several generations of the world, that a hand may help a hand, and a father may teach a brother, and we all be taught of God.’—Jeremy Taylor, *The Minister’s Duty*, Vol. vi. p. 508. Taylor means only here that every divine cannot be expected to be a first-rate critic. When I say that the books which he recommends to the divine who is not so, are the works of Augustine, Athanasius, Isidore, Jerome, Œcumenius, the *Catenæ* of the Greek Fathers, and a whole host of more modern commentators, I need not be afraid of my argument being much hurt by this qualification.

² Bishop Bull, *Some Points, &c.*, I. p. 240. If the remark was applicable to Bull’s time, how much more applicable is it to ours! See too Chrysostom, *de Sac.* iv. 4, who puts this argument very strongly. Hilary (*de Trin. Lib.* xii. p. 1122) says very well, after pointing out the necessity of the minister being prepared with refutation of error from his deeper knowledge of

beseech you, at the conflict and storm of religious opinions ; at the facility with which error, as we believe, most pernicious, is generated ; the zeal and earnestness with which it is propagated. Look, (if it indeed be necessary to add any thing of a temporary nature to arguments which, resting on the imperfect constitution of man's nature, are as enduring as he is,) look, I say, to the present diffusion of superficial information, mistaken by the wretched weakness of enthusiasts for a general increase of real knowledge ; look at the pitiable combination of vanity suggesting the examination of every subject, however deep and difficult, and of ignorance, on every subject involving itself in error and mistake. Look, again, to the corruptions of primitive truth, the stains on her fair beauty ; look to the activity and virulence of open or insidious hostility to all religion ; and remember that it is our task to defend religion in all her extent against the ingenious sophistry with which error is insinuated, the hardihood with which

the scheme of salvation, ' *Fidem non nudam Apostolus (2 Cor. x. 4, 5) atque inopem rationis reliquit ; quæ quamvis potissima ad salutem sit, tamen nisi per doctrinam instruatur, habebit quidem inter adversa tutum refugiendi recessum, non etiam retinebit constantem obnitendi securitatem ; eritque ut infirmibus [inermibus ?] sunt post fugam castra, non etiam ut castra habentibus adest interrita fortitudo.*'

evidence is rejected, the doubts with which the genuineness of Scripture is assailed, and the perverseness by which it is misinterpreted. See then at once how wide a field of necessary knowledge presents itself. We are appointed to teach the faith deduced from Scripture by an especial Church¹, and we are therefore bound to ascertain what that faith is, and to rescue ourselves from the misrepresentations of adversaries, who impute to us opinions which we do not hold, or conceal those which we do. And this must be done by a painful and careful examination of the writings and opinions of the founders of the Church, and by a far, far more careful examination of Scripture itself². Handed down to us from distant ages,

¹ ‘Be mindful that you are to deliver no doctrine of your own, but the doctrine of Holy Scripture, as it has been understood and interpreted by the consenting voice of all pious antiquity; by those true and faithful members of the Christian Church, in all times, in all places, and even amidst the growth of adscititious error, to whom the greatest worthies of our own National Church invariably refer. This doctrine no well instructed minister of the Church of England can be at a loss to determine. It is contained in those venerable formularies which our fathers retained or derived from most remote antiquity, and it is supported throughout by most clear and indisputable warrant of Holy Scripture.’—Bishop Jebb’s Sermons, p. 292.

² There are many very valuable remarks on the study of Scripture in Jeremy Taylor’s second Sermon on Titus ii. 7.—Works, Vol. vi. p. 507. ‘Their

and written in foreign tongues, how shall we excuse ourselves if we neglect, in some degree, to make ourselves masters of its criticism and interpretation; so that, on the one hand, we may be able to admit or refute on solid grounds the arguments which impugn the genuineness of any part of it, and that, on the other, we may not be misled by an ignorance of the real principles of interpretation, into folly and falsehood? But these principles cannot be gained without the study of other authors, and no such study can be too extensive¹;

‘Their chief study should be that of their commission—the Holy Scriptures. The way to speak skilfully from God is often to hear him speak. “The Lord God hath given thee the tongue of the learned,” saith the Evangelic prophet, (chiefly intending Christ,) “to speak a word in season to the weary.” Ay, that is the learnedest tongue when all is done;—but how?—“He wakeneth me morning by morning; he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned.” Isa. l. 4.’—Leighton, iii. p. 474. See Chrysost. de Sac. iv. 3 and 4, and many early councils, as Concil. Tolet. iii. 7; iv. 24. See Bingham, b. vi. ch. iii. § 3.

¹ I might have added here, with great truth, that ‘if there be only a cordial attachment to what is honest, lovely, and of good report, the deeper draughts a man has taken of those intellectual streams, which, through God’s providential appointment, have been poured forth by the sages and poets of antiquity, the more deeply will he relish that sublimity and beauty, which the more immediate influence of Heaven has diffused over the expanse of Scripture.’—Bishop Jebb’s Sermons, p. 298. For the opinions delivered in the text I may refer to quotations from

nay, this one word, *Interpretation*, of itself, implies, as it were, an encyclopædia of knowledge, a knowledge comprehending the most entire, and most familiar acquaintance with the history and customs of every ancient nation. Nor even then is this part of our task accomplished. In the certainty that, as the water which first rises from the spring, is clearer than that which in a lengthened course has mixed itself with the soil of the channel¹, so the first ages of the Church were the purest, we must hardly acquiesce in any interpretation of Scripture doctrine till we know whether it has received a sanction from the Primitive Church; and a knowledge of her opinions on the various points of Christian doctrine cannot be gained but by long and extensive study². We must, indeed,

Bishop Bull, already made in the note on p. 51, l. 23. ““Search the Scriptures,” saith Christ; “Non dixit legite sed scrutamini,” said St. Chrysostom, “quia oportet profundius effodere, ut quæ alte delitescunt invenire possimus.” Turn over every page, inquire narrowly, look diligently, converse with them perpetually, be mighty in the Scriptures, for that which is plain there is the best measure of our faith and doctrines.’—Jeremy Taylor, vi. p. 520.

¹ Bishop Hall, Works, Vol. ix. p. 531.

² ‘Frame your life and preaching to the Canons of the Church*,’

* A study of the canons was often enjoined by the Councils. See Concil. Tolet. iv. 24, in Bingham, b. vi. ch. 3, § 3.

as our Saviour himself has told us, if ‘we are scribes instructed unto the kingdom of heaven, be

to the doctrines of antiquity, to the sense of the ancient and holy Fathers. For it is otherwise in theology than it is in other learnings. The experiments of philosophy are rude at first, and the observations weak, and the principles improved; and he that made the first lock was not so good a workman as we have now-a-days; but in Christian religion they that were first were best, because God, not man, was the Teacher; and ever since that, we have been unlearning the wise notices of pure religion, and mingling them with human notices, and human interest.’—Jeremy Taylor, vi. p. 531. I cannot refer to a more pleasing or spirited defence of the study of the Fathers, in a literary point of view, than that of Bishop Jebb in his *Sermons*, pp. 338—344. Waterland’s ‘Importance of the Doctrine of the Trinity,’ ch. vii. has shown more clearly than any one the use and value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity, in controversies on points of faith. Dr. Hey (*Lectures*, b. i. ch. xiii. § 10, and following) has some admirable remarks on the use of the Fathers.

After all Middleton’s outrageous abuse of the Fathers, (see his *Preface*, p. xxviii.) even he is obliged to allow their use in attesting and transmitting Scripture; in teaching us the doctrines, rites, manners, and harmony of their several ages, though as witnesses only; and in warning us by their very errors. *Introductory Discourse*, xxvi. (*Works*, Vol. i. 2nd edit.)

‘Can we mistake or miscarry by complying with the great body of God’s Church through all ages, and particularly with those great lights of the Primitive Church, who, by the excellency of Christian knowledge and the integrity of their virtue, have so illustrated our holy religion?’—Barrow, Vol. iii. *Sermon* xxiv. p. 276, ed. 1680.

like the householder which bringeth forth out of his treasure things new and old '.

Need I add to what I have said? Need I tell you of the time and attention irresistibly claimed by the study of the evidences of Christianity? Need I tell you with what zeal and earnestness you must undertake the study of moral and practical divinity², of the piety required by the Christian law, the duties and the holiness it enjoins, and the motives by which those duties and that holiness

¹ See Bishop Blomfield's Sermon on this text, p. 19.

² 'It is one stratagem of the arch enemy of mankind (and when we know his wiles, we may be the better able to defeat him), by busying men of great and useful parts in matters and things of lesser consequence, to divert them from following that *unum necessarium*, that which should be the main in all our endeavours, the beating down of sin, the planting of faith, and the reformation of manners. Controversies, I confess, are necessary, the tongues necessary, history necessary, philosophy and the arts necessary, other knowledge of all sorts necessary in the Church; for truth must be maintained, Scripture-phrases opened, heresie confuted, the mouths of adversaries stopped, schisms and novelties suppressed. But when all is done, positive and practick Divinity it is must bring us to heaven. that is, it must poise our judgments, settle our consciences, direct our lives, mortify our corruptions, increase our graces, strengthen our comforts, save our souls. Hoc opus, hoc studium: there is no study to this, none so well worth the labour as this, none that can bring so much profit to others, nor therefore so much glory to God; nor therefore so much comfort to our own hearts as this.'—Bp. Sanderson, Third Sermon (on 1 Cor. xii. 7.) ad Clerum.

is to be enforced? Need I remind you that all these acquirements will be in vain, all the benefits of your knowledge lost, unless you possess also the art of communicating with plainness and simplicity, but with earnestness and fervour, to others, what you possess yourselves; and that this is an art which cannot be gained but by patient study and constant imitation of the best models¹? Need I

¹ There are some very valuable remarks on the style of parochial preaching in Bishop Sumner's work, called 'Apostolical Preaching,' p. 9, 5th edit. But Bishop Sumner appears to me to make parochial preaching a much easier thing than it really is. In stating his opinion to that effect, he says that the preacher 'must descend from the high and lofty tone of language to which he is accustomed, to walk in the humble terms of Scripture; he must limit his rounded periods to the extent of vulgar comprehension: he must abound in interrogations and addresses which the rules of composition condemn.' This is perfectly true; but this very limitation of rounded periods, so that dulness shall not be mistaken for simplicity, appears to me to require great study and pains; and the interrogations and addresses, of which Bishop Sumner speaks, effective as they assuredly are, will become offensive and wearisome when not regulated by a just taste and knowledge of the best models. Bishop Sumner would, I fear, think the assertion extravagant; but I am well convinced that the village preacher of good sense might be much benefited by the study of Demosthenes, or of any other of those great masters who to mighty eloquence have added a profound knowledge of the human heart. South, after inculcating with great force the necessity of plain preaching, says, 'Those two stand best by mutual support and communication; elocution

ask, if it be possible for you to approach even the imperfect standard I have set up, unless, in the

without wisdom being empty and irrational, and wisdom without elocution barren and unprofitable.'—Sermons, Vol. v. p. 465.

'We are not to teach men new doctrines, but to clear, defend, and apply the old to the consciences of men. It is very easy to shoot over the people's heads, and to spend an hour to little or no purpose; but *it requires all our skill to preach plainly without flatness*, and to set the matters of religion in the best light, and to recommend them to the people with the greatest force of persuasion. It is no hard matter to trifle away the time, but it is so, to speak suitably, warmly, and effectually to the hearts of our hearers, to make them find the same effect of our preaching which the two disciples did when Christ, unknown, was discoursing with them, "when they said one to another," &c. (Luke xxiv. 32.) That is, then, the best way of preaching which hath light and heat together, which clears the Scriptures to the people's capacities, and warms their affections to spiritual things. And it is hardly possible to mistake as to the best method of preaching, if men do but judge aright concerning the end and design of it. For there must be strength and clearness to convince, and a close application to men's consciences to excite and persuade them to the practice of those things which men can hardly be ignorant of, and yet are very backward to do. And therefore this must be the chief work and business of our preaching; which none ought to undervalue or be ashamed of, who do in earnest believe in God and another world; none ought to neglect, whose peculiar office and dignity it is to take care of men's souls; and none will be careless in it, who have a regard to their own brothers' souls.'—Stillington's Ordination Sermon, Works, Vol. i. p. 367 (fol. edit. 1710).

fullest meaning of the Apostle's words, 'you give attendance to reading'¹?

The standard is indeed a low and imperfect one; I have brought to your notice the very smallest portion of knowledge necessary for a minister of God's word, only that, without which his flock, if not misled by him, will be ever misled by the ignorant enthusiast; only that, without which even the superficial information so generally spread will triumph over him, and the wretched and contemptible teacher will be disgraced by the superior information of the taught². Would to

¹ 1 Tim. iv. 13. Some commentators understand here rather public reading. But both Macknight and Rosenmüller, as well as more ancient writers, conceive private study to be included in the admonition.

² 'The exigencies of the present day call with peculiar emphasis for a studious and learned clergy. This is an age both of inquiry and observation: and shall it be said that Christian ministers are least diligent in the most important concern? What useful science, what mechanic art, what that tends to increase the comforts, to multiply the decorations, or improve the finer tastes of cultivated life, is not pursued with avidity? and shall we be put to shame by the reproach that we are cold and indolent in the study of those truths which involve our dearest interests for time and for eternity? This reproach there is but one method of escaping. Within and without the pale of our Establishment, investigation is afloat, and in too many instances engendering those erroneous and strange doctrines, contrary to God's word,

God that the danger and the disgrace of incompetence were more distinctly perceived and warmly felt ; that it were oftener remembered whose word it is that ‘ the priest’s lips are to keep knowledge, that the people are to seek the law at his mouth,’ that he is bound by every tie of duty to them and to God, by every solemn motive of love to mankind in general, and of especial tenderness to that flock whom he has undertaken to nourish with the bread of life, and by every motive of fear for himself, to gain and to give that light for which they look up to him !

But in this, as in similar cases, men too often deceive themselves by evading the question of absolute competence or incompetence, and making it far too much a matter of degree of ability : and they calm their consciences by thinking that they possess a share at least of the qualifications required. Whether in the Church, indeed, or out of it, men are apt, in estimating their own fitness, which at our ordination we solemnly engaged with all care and diligence to banish and drive away. We shall not then be found faithful ; and shame and woe must be our portion, if we do not so study, that we may be ready to give an answer to every man for the hope that is in us, and to oppose, as occasion may require, the sincere word of the Gospel, and the sober but sublime spirituality of the Church, to a cold rationalizing semi-Christianity on the one hand, and to a zeal not according to knowledge on the other.’—Bishop Jebb, *Sermons*, p. 327.

and the duties required of them, so extremely to exaggerate the one, and diminish the other, that many whom an impartial observer would pronounce disgraceful and mischievous, would feel genuine and unaffected surprise if their competency were called in question. And this observation applies far more to the Church than to any other profession; for the effects produced by a due discharge of duties imposed on other men, are visible, and the result of their neglect is visible also; they relate to external things, and live and die with them. The good or the evil we do lives after us, indeed, and after those to whom it is done; but it is rarely visible; it relates to the spirit, and meets not the carnal eye of sense. The outward signs of peace and comfort may be seen, where an idle and incompetent Minister has been the cause of destruction within; and so we are deceived, and so we deceive ourselves into the belief, that while we discharge the external part of our office with decorum, and comply with the requisitions of the law, all is well. We cry peace, when there is no peace, and give ourselves up too often with a careless confidence to any pursuit, and any employment, but those of our profession.

I have been speaking, I say, so far to all who are about to enter our holy profession; not especially to those inclined to study, not to those endowed

with any peculiar gifts or graces of the intellect. I have spoken of necessary knowledge only, and of endowments which are to be expected from every Minister of the Gospel. But I cannot refrain from adding a few words on the dignity and grandeur of the study, on the irresistible claims which it possesses to the devotion of the mightiest talents and the richest endowments, from its intrinsic character, from the extent of the research to which it leads, from the grandeur of the objects it investigates, and from the permanent elevation of the intellect through the knowledge it bestows. For we are destined too often to hear a cry and a clamour of a different kind. We are told that these studies are old, that they go over ground already so often trodden, as to leave no scope for talent, no room for discovery ; that they confine the powers of the mind, capable as it is of higher flights and nobler darings, of assisting the march of intellect, and the progress of knowledge. In a word, Divinity is not Science ; this is the head and front of its offending, and this is at present an offending hardly pardonable. But why this unnecessary warfare ? why this unreasonable comparison of the general with the particular, this unjust depression of the superior before the inferior ? Why is it not seen, that the charge which the votaries of science bring against our

study, of confining the views and degrading the faculties, may be far more justly directed against their own? True, indeed, it is, that science, in her highest estate, has been, and may be, used to elevate the mind from a contemplation of the works of God, to the contemplation of God himself. True it is too, that in her highest estate she educes and exercises some of the most valuable faculties of the human mind. But of those who devote themselves to science, how few can boast this happy result, how few rise beyond the mere congestion and arrangement of facts ; and how many, therefore, may pass away from the world with half their faculties undeveloped and dead? They have been at best instruments, mere instruments, for promoting the march of intellect ; but what has been the march of their own? They may have accelerated the progress of knowledge, so called ; but what knowledge have they acquired for themselves? Intellect and knowledge are not the joint stock of the world, which every one is interested in augmenting. Mankind, as a class, can be elevated only by the elevation of every individual whom it embraces ; and we mistake miserably, if, in the desire of promoting the progress of light and knowledge in the world, we do not lay the foundation in the progress and elevation of our own minds.

Such a progress, we assert with confidence, is the effect of the study of Divinity. In the mighty round of knowledge which it embraces, what is introduced which does not for its own excellence deserve admission, which does not of its own nature tend to exercise and elevate the faculties, and to pour on them the light of permanent and precious knowledge? Where does Divinity lay its foundation but in the loftiest speculations, the being and attributes of God, and his moral government of the world? What is its proper province but the mind of man, its nature, the laws by which it is guided, its strength and its weakness? Where does it look for proof of the superiority of the moral system it inculcates, but to the study and contemplation of all that the wise, and great, and good, the philosopher and the moralist of other times, have achieved by the light of unassisted reason? I should insult you by offering any proof, that intimately linked as the history of religion is with the history of man, the most intimate knowledge of history is an indispensable requisite in the formation of a great divine; and that his character is equally incomplete without an extensive and intimate acquaintance with several of the languages of the ancient world, a research into their analogies and their formation, or, in other words, into the laws of human thought. Thus, then, of all men, the

divine is perpetually conversant with those deep and mighty questions, which, if here below they have received no solution, and admit none, have ever exercised, and formed, and strengthened, the minds of the greatest and wisest of mankind. Literature sheds forth all her stores and all her refinements for him; and science herself is not beyond the pale of his research. Whatever strength the mind can receive from perpetual exercise and devotion to the most difficult and laborious study, whatever refinement it can obtain from converse with the loftiest thoughts, the purest minds, and the sublimest writings, that strength and that refinement is ours; ours is the study to which the great and wide universe alone sets the limit, and which grasps within itself all the perfections and dimensions of human science¹.

Who then shall presume to say that this study

¹ 'There is no knowledge which lays open the human mind, no knowledge which unfolds in the history of man his principles and character, no knowledge which, disclosing the secrets of nature, shows the agreement between the works and the word of God, no knowledge which, elevating the imagination, refining the taste, and quickening the sensibility, gives to eloquence its power over the heart, there is no knowledge of this description which by the Christian minister may not be made "to help" to the successful discharge of his office, and which, therefore, in reference to this supreme end, he may not pursue.'—Bishop Hobart's Charge, in 1815, p. 37.

retards the growth of man's mind, and so prevents the fairest flower of God's earthly garden from blossoming into the perfectness of beauty? Who shall disparage that study which exercises, exalts, strengthens, and purifies, and which has for its end the conduct of an immortal soul to a state of enjoyment adapted to its requirements, and as immortal as itself? To him who believes that the grave is the last house of man, I appeal not ; but to all who believe that beyond that house there is another not made with hands, be the blessed conviction produced in him by the influence of Revelation, or the light of reason, be he believer or unbeliever, I do appeal to judge in the controversy, whether any scientific study, any study of that matter which must die to the passing spirit, even if itself were eternal, can be comparable to that higher study which directs all its efforts to the improvement and exaltation of the undying spirit itself? To the Christian I appeal yet more strongly, and ask of him, if the Bible be the Word of God, if Christianity be no fond dream of man's imagination, if it alone contain the germs and seeds of eternal and unperishing truth ; whether it is not more, yea far more, important, than the knowledge of those forms and laws of matter which, by the very decree of the Wisdom to which they owe their being, are to perish with the world to

which they relate? And so I call on all and each of you who are about to enter our sacred profession, and whom God has raised above your fellows by superior powers and superior energies of mind, to remember that, as you are called on at your admission to God's service, 'to lay aside the study of the world and the flesh, and to be diligent in prayer and in reading of the Holy Scripture, and in such studies as help to a knowledge of the same',¹ so the importance and the grandeur of the study required of you increases the obligation, and deprives you of all possible excuse if you neglect the promise you have made.

Let me venture to address the same exhortation to those among my hearers who are already numbered amongst the Ministers of God, with that unfeigned humility which alone can become me, but with that plainness of speech which also becomes a Minister of the Gospel, wheresoever and whensoever he exercises his high and holy office, and which authorizes him to address the word of admonition and exhortation to all men, how much soever his superiors, be it in talents or in learning, in the natural or the acquired gifts and graces of the intellect. Let me, I say, address an earnest exhortation to all who are fixed

¹ Ordination Service.

here as members of our sacred profession, frequently to call to mind the serious obligation which lies upon them to make the study of that profession their first and main object in life. I urge this duty on them by all the solemn considerations which can effect and almost overwhelm the mind of man. First of all, and chiefest, although not engaged in the active duties of their function, they too have made the same vow to their heavenly Master; they have received the same powers, and are sent forth with the same commission as their brethren whose lot it is to bear the burthen and heat of the day. And so they are equally bound to carry on the Christian combat, to promote their Master's cause, and do God's work in the world. In the world, indeed, in one sense, they cannot do it; their light cannot shine before men in the daily discharge of the pastoral duties of the Minister of God. But they are, therefore, the more bound to glorify that Master whose service they have chosen, in the only way still open to them, by rendering themselves really masters in Israel, mighty in word, in thought, in knowledge, ever ready to confute the gainsayer, and to join their brethren who are busy in tending the flock, in the toil and danger of keeping away the wolves from the fold.

This is the first part of their obligation, common to them with others, from the nature of the service

they have chosen. But as they enjoy special advantages, so from those advantages there spring up corresponding obligations ; if less weighty than the first, too weighty for them on whom they lie to escape. The temporal advantages they enjoy were bestowed that here there might ever be schools of the prophets ; that here, at least, many of God's Ministers might be saved not only from the severity of labour, which ever attends the due discharge of the pastoral office, but from those harassing and spirit-breaking conflicts with evil men and evil minds, which waste the time, embitter the happiness, and disturb the mind of God's servants in the world ; that they might give themselves wholly and unreservedly to the study of his Word, of all that can illustrate his counsels and dealings with mankind, and enforce those commandments by which he seeks to promote the well-being of his creatures. I say not that all the advantages are on their side, for God, who by an ever-operating system of compensation affords to all, if not equal, yet sufficient means of happiness and usefulness, bestows, I know, on those who are engaged in the arduous conflict, some aids, which they who require them not, enjoy not. Nor am I less firmly persuaded that the necessity for the constant exertion of mind and thought creates or calls into action the powers it requires. But chequered as active

life ever is with trouble and affliction, torn and wounded as the hearts of the parochial Clergy who are engaged in it must therefore be, by many sufferings, many disappointments, and many fears, more especially in their domestic and parental character, it cannot be denied that they who have given no hostages to fortune, enjoy here, in a far higher degree, the repose, the leisure, and the facilities, so advantageous and desirable for study. Such then being the design, and such the advantages of these institutions, what question can be raised as to the duties to which they give rise in those who enjoy them under such conditions as I have described, sometimes expressed, and always implied? What question, that every secular study, and every secular pursuit, even that least secular of all, the instruction of the young men of the country in all that can adorn them in their characters as men and Christians, must be undertaken only in subordination to studies and pursuits of a higher class and character; only so as to enable you to keep your ordination vow, and do your duty to your peculiar station, to your profession and your God?

Although I have thus ventured to set before you the general necessity for study in the Clergy, it would be a great height of presumption to venture

here to point out any especial plan¹. But one single recommendation to the student I trust will

¹ Secker lays down a line of Theological study thus (in his First Charge): 'A thorough acquaintance with the Christian faith: 1. the grounds; 2. the doctrines. The previous requisites are: a knowledge of the rules of right reasoning—a knowledge of the moral and religious truths taught by nature—a knowledge of the early history of the world—a knowledge of the history of the time of Christ in especial. Then a diligent search into Scripture, in the original at least of the New Testament; it would be better if that of the Old Testament were known more. With Scripture writings in proof of the authority of Scripture, and the truth of its matter; these to be compared with objections. The doctrines, especially the disputed ones, are then to be studied with great care—adhering strictly to Scripture—not aiming at novelty, nor overvaluing antiquity, especially what is not the earliest, but especially guarding against a desire of novelty. The government, worship, discipline, and establishment of our Church, we ought to be well acquainted with; but controversy must not take us from the study of *practical* religion.'

Bishop Jebb has the following remarks in his Charge (Practical Theology, i. 359): 'For the present, therefore, I will simply remind you, that the study of Divinity comprises two great departments, neither of which can be neglected by a conscientious Minister. I mean, the critical, and the practical: the critical department, comprehensively viewed, embracing whatever relates to the grammatical, historical, and doctrinal interpretation of Scripture; the evidences, also, of our holy faith; the controversies, which, from time to time, have agitated the Church; and, in a word, all those branches of Christian Theology, in

not be deemed improper ; that at least in re-commencing his studies after ordination, he should

which the intellect is principally engaged.' 2. 'The practical department, including the devotional study of Sacred Scripture, together with the moral and spiritual writings of pious and good men, and particularly the lives of those, who were distinguished in their generation, as lights and samples of the Christian world ; in brief, all that reading, which is primarily addressed to the affections, and which is more advantageously pursued in the retirement of the closet. 3. Neither of these departments can be safely neglected ; neither, I will add, can be brought to a successful issue, independently of the other : the critical without the practical, engendering "that knowledge which puffeth up:" the practical without the critical, enkindling "a zeal not according unto knowledge;" while from the union of the two, and from that alone, we may reasonably expect the love which edifieth. And thus much I can venture to say, after no slight consideration of the subject, that the divines most eminent in the profounder and more recondite parts of theological learning, have excelled also as devotional and practical writers ; while again, those divines, whose works are, by common consent, the devotional manuals of the Christian world, have been largely conversant with most kinds of scriptural and theological information. Those great men, we, in our degree, are bound to imitate. We are not, indeed, nor is it desirable we should be, all of us theological writers ; but we are, and we ought to be, all of us Christian pastors. We have all undertaken the momentous work, to save ourselves, and to save them who hear us : this work, as it respects our hearers, and as it respects ourselves, we cannot possibly fulfil, unless we both understand and feel the words of eternal life ; and it is certain, that, without

discard those compilations and abridgments¹, which are too much in use among us, and which, though perhaps the necessary milk for babes in theology, are assuredly not the meat for strong men. Be persuaded to renounce the trifling convenience of having a variety of information, culled from the most remote quarters, thrown into one undigested whole. Be persuaded that the page the fullest of facts, is very far from the fullest of information; that there is no royal road to theology; that proficiency in that most extensive and lofty of all sciences can be attained only, like proficiency in any other study, by individual labour and thought, not by resigning our judgments and our faculties to the first compilation which may fall into our hands.

In connexion with this remark, it may be observed that, if we seek rightly to appreciate the nature of our religion from its effects, the widest study of ecclesiastical history in its original sources is more

practical reading, we cannot feel, without critical reading, we cannot understand, the great truths of the Gospel.

¹ In king James I.'s directions to the University of Oxford in 1616, the 7th article is as follows: 'That young students in divinity be directed to study in such books as be most agreeable to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, and incited to bestow their times in the fathers and councils, schoolmen, histories, and controversies, and not insist too long upon compendiums and abbreviations, making them the ground of their study in divinity.'—Heylin's *Life of Laud*, p. 72.

especially indispensable. So alone can the general character of its disciples be understood; so alone can we learn to despise the partiality and prejudice of the infidel historian, and the vulgar jest of the cold divine¹, who, instead of lamenting that inferiority of man, which prevails, alas! over the brightest and best of our race, have raked together every fault, every infirmity, and every vice of the early Christians, and sought to represent this mass of folly and of weakness, as the product of Christianity, and the usual rule of life of the most distinguished of the primitive Christians, and not, as it really was in the majority of instances, the melancholy exception to lives of Christian virtue and general utility. Again, by such a study alone can the truth in controversy be known, and not by the adduction of particular passages and disputes upon them. Where, for example, shall we find the true answer to the question as to the primacy of the Roman Pontiff, but in the general voice of history, which must know the fact, and cannot conceal it?

¹ I need hardly say that I refer to Gibbon and Jortin. I know few books written in a lower spirit than Jortin's remarks on ecclesiastical history. That a man, whose Latin compositions display so refined and elegant a taste, should have been capable of such extreme flippancy and pertness as that work displays, is melancholy; but it is far more so to find a clergyman capable of using such a tone on such a subject.

It is not by a refutation of the argument from the noted phrase of Irenæus, or other insulated passages in the fathers, but from the general tenor of their writings, that we shall establish the fact, that though there were as many monarchies in the Church as there were metropolitan sees¹, one general monarchy was never known.

I have intruded already too long on your time or your patience. Yet let us not part without remembering with what feelings we are to acquire, with what feelings we are to use, the treasures of priestly knowledge of which I have spoken. Although we preach the Gospel, although we preach it in the full maturity of every kind and degree of knowledge which can adorn our profession, although the clear and convincing argument, the fruit of long and patient research, be set forth in the persuasive garb of the highest eloquence and the warmest fervours, we have nought to glory of. That lesson of humility which is to be repeated to every man in the pride of his heart, belongs to us, and to our calling, most of all. We have, indeed, nought to glory of that we can do in the salvation of souls. It is His work whose Spirit goes forth with us, and speaks through us to the heart; our share of the work is only too often to quench His gracious in-

¹ This subject is ably treated in Deyling's *Observationes Sacrae*, T. iv. p. 1. Ex. 6.

fluence by our coldness, and stop the genial current of grace in its full course, by our insufficiency, and our indifference. Our best knowledge and our brightest eloquence are the instruments by which He works the salvation of man, but it is He, and He alone who is its Author; He alone sows the seed here below, He alone visits it with the genial dew and sunshine, He alone brings it to the harvest-time above. Without Him what were mortal learning, mortal eloquence, and mortal zeal! Without Him how vain were all we know! vainer than the tinkling cymbal, vainer than vanity itself! These, indeed, are the instruments with which it pleases Him to work, and woe be to us if they be not polished and tempered for the work; but woe to us also if for the instrument we desire a glory not its own, or if we assume to ourselves any share of that glory which belongs to Him. Woe to us if in our best and brightest hours, when the blessed work goes on most successfully, we say not from our inmost heart, Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us! if we are not for ever on our guard against the dangers of fame, and the temptations of praise; if charity be not the companion, and humility the mistress of all our acquirements; if we do not remember that earthly knowledge, yea, even heavenly knowledge, defiled and degraded by a mixture with earthly passion, puffeth up, but charity alone edi-

fieth ; if we do not humble ourselves with the remembrance of the imperfection of our highest acquirements, and prepare ourselves by something better than even the best knowledge, by Christian holiness, for that time when we shall no longer know only in part, but our glimmering of light shall be swallowed up in the eternal sunshine that shall break upon us.

SERMON IV.

2 COR. iv. 1.

*Therefore seeing we have this ministry, as we have received
mercy, we faint not.*

I AM now come to a part of my subject on which I feel the highest diffidence, and the highest difficulty; for I am now to speak of the effect which the belief in the possession of a divine commission must have on the conduct of those who possess it, and to offer that advice which every minister of God requires himself. But let it be remembered, that here especially my aim and object is to speak to those who are about to take the priesthood on themselves, and to correct the erroneous impressions which are too often entertained as to its nature, and the duties it enjoins; to deter the profligate, and awaken the careless, by setting before them the danger of the office they undertake, and the heavy responsibility which they incur. And there are, indeed, many circumstances peculiar to

the state of things among us which render such admonitions necessary. The very advantages which we enjoy, and for which we owe such heartfelt gratitude to Almighty God, like all other human advantages and blessings, are not, and cannot be, productive of unmixed good. The early age at which candidates for the ministry are entitled to admission into it, and the peculiar nature of English education, which by laying down the same course of study for all, whatever be their future destination, detains the student in divinity from professional studies, and professional reflection, till almost the time when he is to enter on his duties, must, at least, in some degree, necessarily prevent him from fully weighing the importance and dignity of his profession. Again, after admission to the ministry, the feeling, at least, and the practice of a Protestant and free country, prevent that exercise of ecclesiastical authority which tends to restrain the ministers of God from habits, and feelings, and employments, foreign to their ecclesiastical character. There are other circumstances in the nature of our Church which obviously tend to assign to its ministers a distinct station in the world, and by engaging them in the relations of social and domestic life, to mix them up in some degree with it. From the union of all these circumstances, it too often happens that the prevailing feeling in the mind of

the aspirant to the ministry, is, that he is about to enter into a profession which will rank him with the gentlemen of the country, and place him in a station where, as he may partake in great measure of their habits and employments, so it will be sufficient if he be a partaker, too, in their feelings, and guided by their rule of right. This is a pernicious and a fatal error. Far, very far be it from us to depreciate, or to undervalue, a character so highly and so deservedly prized, as that to which we have alluded ; but we should be guilty of a gross injustice to our own profession if we did not assert, that a Christian priest is a character far higher ; and that as he is higher in his objects and employments, so he ought to be animated by loftier views, and guided by stricter principles to a more holy practice¹. This, at least, we may assert, and

¹ ‘ Many things are lawful for the people which are scandalous in the clergy ; you are tied to more abstinences, to more severities, to more renunciations and self-denials ; you may not with that freedom receive secular contentments that others may, you must spend more time in prayers, your alms must be more bountiful and your hands more open, your hearts enlarged ; others must relieve the poor, you must take care of them ; others must show themselves their brethren, but you must be their fathers ; they must pray frequently and fervently, but you must give “ yourselves up wholly to the word of God and prayer ;” they must “ watch and pray that they fall not into temptations,” but you must watch for yourselves and others too ;

it suffices for our present purpose, that the two characters are widely different in their objects ; and that while we are bound to promote at all times an affectionate and friendly intercourse between them, we betray a fatal and a disgraceful ignorance of the nature, the importance, and the objects of our mission, when we condescend to affect the manners and employments which do not belong to it, and endeavour to sink the character of the priest in that of the respectable and honourable member of civil society.

For while we believe, and remember that we have received a commission from God, we must remember the purposes for which it was bestowed ; if we believe that we are instituted means, we must believe that we are instituted for an especial end ;

the people must mourn when they sin, but you must mourn for your own infirmities and for the sins of others ; and indeed, if the life of a clergyman does not exceed even the piety of the people, that life is in some degree scandalous.'—Jeremy Taylor, Works, vol. vi. p. 505. 'Ηγεῖσθαι ἰδιώτον μὲν εἶναι κακίαν, τὸ φαῦλα πράσσειν, καὶ ὅσα κολάσεως ἄξια, ὧν καὶ ὁ νόμος βαρὺς δεσπότης, ἄρχοντος δὲ ἢ προεστῶτος, τὸ μὴ ὡς ἄριστον εἶναι, καὶ αἰεὶ τῷ καλῷ προβαίνοντι.—Greg. Naz. Apol. Op. T. 1. p. 8, A. Τοσοῦτον ὀφείλεται εἶναι τὸ μέσον τοῦ ἱερωμένου καὶ τοῦ εὐδοκίμου, ὅσον οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς τὸ διάφορον. — Isidor. Pelusiot. Ep. ii. p. 205. Vult liberum a crimine esse doctrinæ cælestis prædicatorem, vult eloquia sua a casti corporis casto ore tractari. Hilar. in 118. Ps. vi. 5, p. 280. E.

we must look on ourselves as instruments for effecting a given purpose, and we must look on ourselves too as worse, far worse than useless, if that purpose be laid aside or forgotten, or if it be not accomplished through any failure in us. Through any failure in us, I say, for herein do we differ from other means, used by the great Governor of the world for the promotion of his designs, that they are involuntary instruments in his hands, we voluntary ones. We are neither compelled to undertake the task, nor is there any external force which can compel us, when we have done so, to exert the faculties and powers we possess in the performance of it. The motives to such a devotion of our lives and thoughts to the task as can alone ensure its accomplishment, (and that is the point which I shall venture to press on you to-day,) must be a remembrance of Him who gave us the commission to perform it, of the end for which it was bestowed, and of the account we are hereafter to give.

I cannot, indeed, conceive that any man can entertain a sincere or real belief in the proposition I have endeavoured to establish, namely, that we are ministers appointed by God, and yet not feel that every thought of his heart, every deed of his hands, every wish and every desire are to be turned

to the execution of his office and ministry¹. If God our Father, He in whom we live, and move, and

¹ Art thou then a Minister of Christ? Behold the mark at which thou must aim: that thy proficiency may be manifest in all things; not in this, or in that particular branch of thy profession, but in *all* the meditations, *all* the studies, *all* the more active duties, to which thou hast been called; so that, in a word, in conversation, in charity, in spirit, in faith, in purity, in learning, in exhortation, in doctrine, thou mayest exemplify the *completeness* of the Christian Ministry. Nor should this completeness be alarming to any faithful Minister of Christ. Various talents, and various opportunities, of necessity, imply a variety of attainment. It is not requisite, it is not possible, that all should reach the same standard, or that any should excel in every department. In our day, as in that of the Apostle, there are diversities of gifts, diversities of administrations, diversities of operative powers. In the one body of the Church there are many members; and each member has its distinct and appropriate office: the foot cannot be expected to discharge the functions of the ear, nor the hand of the eye; and each member of the Christian Ministry will, at the last day, be responsible only for the talent committed to his charge. But admitting, as we must thankfully admit, these varieties both of pursuit and attainments, we should still be mindful, that there are certain leading qualifications and characteristics, which must be found in all Christian Ministers; that we must, each of us, be watchful in all these things; that we must, each of us, make full proof of our Ministry, in all its integral departments. Every Clergyman is called, is set apart, is bound, has promised at the altar of his God, to be a man of thoughtfulness, a man of prayer, a man of reading, a man separated from the study of the world and the

have our being, He who created and redeemed us, called us from nothing, and endowed us with exalted faculties, yea ! with a spark of his own immortal essence, if he calls us to devote the very gifts we have received from him to his own service, can we hesitate to lay aside every other care and thought in order to obey the call of our Creator, our Father, and our Friend ? If that high and

flesh, a man of all faithful diligence, in all the relations which he bears, and all the duties which he owes to the flock of Christ ; applying himself wholly to this one thing, and drawing all his cares and studies this way. This, and this only, is the completeness towards which we must aspire ; and this, be it observed, demands no extraordinary gifts, no splendour of abilities, no accumulation of accomplishments. Let there only be an honest and good heart, let there only be a due sense of our own weakness, and an earnest desire of will and ability, of strength and power from on high,—and then, by the assistance of God's Holy Spirit, that will be effected for us, and within us, which we can never effect for ourselves. Whether these be our dispositions, and these our desires, it is, indeed, important and indispensable, that we should satisfactorily ascertain ; and in order to this ascertainment, I have at the present but one easy and simple criterion to propose. There is one talent, which we all equally possess—THE TALENT OF TIME. Let us each ask our own hearts, *how do we employ this talent ?* The answer will enable us to determine, how far we possess the dispositions and desires belonging to our holy calling ; how far we may hope to exemplify in our lives and conversation the completeness of the Christian Ministry.—Bishop Jebb's Practical Theology, Vol. ii. p. 181.

lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, in the execution of his wonderful plan for the good of the human family, has called on us, the creatures of an hour, the work of his own hand, to participate in some sort in the plan, and in our feeble measure and degree to promote the good, must not the honour whereunto we are called of being ‘labourers together with God¹,’ absorb every other thought, and hope, and desire? Infirm, indeed, must be our fallen nature, if, with such thoughts and views, we can mix up the dregs of earthly hopes, the pollution of earthly passions, the frivolity of earthly employments. Low, indeed, must be our minds, and grovelling our thoughts, if we think it not ‘better to die, than to make our glorying void²,’ by sinking from the height to which God himself hath been pleased to raise us !

Consider, next, the nature of that work to which God has called you ; that it is no less than the elevation of a large portion of the human family from the dominion of ignorance and sin, to that higher condition in which it is his will and desire that they should subsist. Look on the sad case of an overwhelming majority of our brethren, destined to toil, as well as pray, for their daily bread ; and deprived of the opportunities which we enjoy of cultivating and cherishing the gifts and endow-

¹ 1 Cor. iii. 9.

² 1 Cor. ix. 15

ments of that god-like mind, which exalts us above the rest of the animal creation, of purifying the grossness of earthly passion by which its course is impeded, of refining their taste and of exalting their being. See them condemned, as it were, from the moment that their existence begins, to a low and degraded condition, condemned to exchange the prospect of that high exaltation of mental and intellectual wisdom to which man may attain, for the brutal and savage attributes of physical strength; to sink the heavenly in the earthly, and live in darkness rather than light.

But it is not so ! God is their Father as well as ours, and loves them with as tender a love as he does us ; and the glorious inheritance which he hath prepared beyond the grave, is prepared for all his children. He who, in his wisdom, hath made a world where there will ever be diversities of station, where there will ever be hewers of wood, and drawers of water, hath still provided a way by which they whose lot is here low and degraded, may yet not only attain to his heavenly joy, but make themselves qualified for the enjoyment of spiritual happiness. It was Jesus who thanked his heavenly Father, that what ‘he had hidden from the wise and prudent, he had revealed unto babes in worldly knowledge¹.’ It was Jesus,

¹ Matt. xi. 25.

who promised ‘that they who do his will, shall know of his doctrine¹.’ It is Christianity which teaches that there never existed a full faith in the divine word of wisdom, which did not enlighten the understanding, while it improved the heart ; that a course of Christian patience and purity subdues the passion and prejudice, which prevent the entrance of wisdom, far more than want of learning or of education, and qualifies the mind for the reception of the most spiritual and exalted truth. It gives not, it cannot, and it need not give, the power of transmitting, of explaining, of defending the truth ; it is a light which, as it is given to the individual, and is the reward for individual holiness, exists for the individual alone². It is to be gained by faith, by repentance, and by holiness ; and we, who are God’s ministers, are to be the instruments of its attainment, by the patient and persevering inculcation of this Christian faith, and Christian holiness. This is our work, this our glorious calling. We are thus made the agents in effecting a blessed change in our brethren, in exalting them from their low and melancholy condition, and in raising them from almost the

¹ John vii. 17.

² See the first of Mr. Miller’s Bampton Lectures, a work which, for originality of thought, for refined taste, and for piety, need yield to no production of the present day.

level of the animal creation, to the enjoyment and dignity of a spiritual and intellectual existence.

And whose heart burns not within him at the prospect of such extensive utility, such glorious employment? Who, that knows the beauty, and dignity, and glory of the human mind, the image of its Maker, mourns not to see it placed in a situation so fatal, it would seem, to its improvement, so degrading to its powers, so injurious to its excellence? Who joys not like the angels in heaven at the recovery of a lost soul, at the recovery of so many of these chief and first works of God's creation, at their restoration to the state wherein by his will they were to be? Who does not feel that the glory of contributing to that recovery, of working that restoration, is far beyond the gratification of earthly glory, or the attainment of the proudest object of ambition? Who would shrink from the work, who decline the labour, who turn away to earthly hopes and employments? What! shall these poor brethren look up to you for light, and will ye not afford it? shall they call to you from the prison-house of ignorance, and will you not release them? shall they ask you for the bread of life, and will ye refuse to feed them¹?

¹ Scougal (in Bishop Jebb's republication, p. 227): 'We are not intrusted with their fortune and estate, nor with their bodily health and welfare, nor with the affairs of state, nor with the

But ye are called, my brethren, to release mankind from a closer prison-house, and a worse interests of kingdoms ; though, indeed, religion has no small influence on these ; and the labours of ministers, if successful, would contribute exceedingly to the public tranquillity and the present felicity of men. But our main business lies another way. We have to do with rational and immortal souls : these most noble and divine substances, which proceeded from God, and are capable of being united to him eternally ; but, withal, in hazard of being eternally separated from him—"These stakes," as the poetical and philosophic Father calls them, "between God and the Devil*," and on us it, in some measure, depends, to whose share they shall fall, whether they be angels or fiends.—We may say of our office what the painter vainly boasted of, "we work for eternity †." The impressions we make, last for ever. My beloved, the most serious of our thoughts come very short of the inestimable worth of the "depositum," that treasure which is committed to our care. He who created and redeemed the souls of men best understands their value ; and we see in what esteem he holds them, by the pains which he is pleased to take about them. Their salvation was contrived, before the mountains were brought forth, before the foundation of the earth was laid ; the design was formed from all eternity, and glorious are the methods by which it is accomplished. "At this, both the law and the prophets aimed, to this purpose the Deity emptied itself, and was clothed with human nature : to this purpose was that strange and wonderful conjunction, God and man united together ‡."

* *Ἀμφισβήτηματα τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ δαιμονῶν.* Synesius.

† *Laboramus æternitati.*

‡ *Huc majestica lex tendit, huc inter Christum et legem interjecti prophetæ ; huc exinanita Deitas ; huc assumpta caro ; huc nova illa mixtio.*—S. Gregor. Naz.

captivity than the prison-house and captivity of ignorance; ye are called to redeem them from the bondage of sin, that tyrant which, by the agency of every foul and evil passion, shuts up the mind against the reception of spiritual truth, and filling it with falsehood, prepares and qualifies it for the abode of misery and woe. You labour, in a word, in the salvation of souls; through your voice God speaks to the sinner; you are the ambassadors of Christ, and in his name¹ ye are to pray

At this end all the actions, and all the sufferings, of our blessed Saviour aimed; for this he was born, and for this he died. And shall we undervalue the price of his blood, or think it a small matter to have the charge of those for whom it was shed? It is the Church of God which we must oversee and feed; that Church for which the world is upheld, which is sanctified by the Holy Ghost, on which the angels themselves attend. What a weighty charge is this we have undertaken! "Who is sufficient for these things?"

South has put one part of the argument of the two or three preceding pages with his usual force. 'He that teacheth another, gives an alms to his soul. He clothes the nakedness of his understanding, and relieves the wants of his impoverished reason. He indeed that governs well, leads the blind, but he that teaches gives him eyes; and it is a glorious thing to have been the repairer of decayed intellect, and a sub-worker to grace, in freeing it from the inconveniences of original sin.' Vol. i. p. 171.

¹ 'What we do in attendance on that ministry, we do in Christ's stead; and therefore ought seriously to consider with ourselves whether the words which we speak unto the people be, for the truth, gravity, and sanctity of them, such as may, with-

your brethren that they will be reconciled unto God; that they will earnestly endeavour to avoid an abiding and eternal condition of ignorance, and passion, and misery, and enter into the rich inheritance prepared for them, of knowledge, and purity, and joy.

And shall one soul lose this rich inheritance through your negligence, through your carelessness be condemned to that everlasting abode of woe? God of his infinite mercy to them, and to you, forbid. To you, I say, for of these souls, which are the objects of God's own special care and love, ye are to render up an account to him. It is the prophet's question, 'What wilt thou say when he shall visit thee?' when he shall ask, 'Where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock¹?' They are the words of the Apostle which I call on you to remember, when I tell you that 'ye watch for the souls of your brethren, as they that must give account².' And I ask you, if you wonder at the feeling of that great and holy father of the Church³, who tells us, that the consideration

out indignity done to Christ, have his name and authority prefixed on them. He will not own the dictates and inventions of men for the oracles of God.'—Bishop Reynolds, Sermon XXIII. Works, Vol. v. p. 355.

¹ Jer. xiii. 20, 21.

² Heb. xiii. 17.

³ See Chrysostom on Heb. xiii. 17. He uses expressions

of that text shook his inmost soul? I ask you, if you do not exclaim with him, 'What a dangerous undertaking is this! What shall one say to the wretched men that carelessly throw themselves into such an abyss of vengeance!' if you do not join in the passionate expression of wonder, that any Ruler in the Church should be saved? If, indeed, it will be a hard task at that awful day for every man to give an account of his own soul, what a task is theirs of whom God will require an account of the souls of other men¹! The account required of the minister of God will be this: whether in godly sincerity and earnestness he has laboured to give light to ignorance, wheresoever he found it in his flock; to build up the young in a most holy faith and practice, to confirm the wavering, to bind down the thoughtless, to resolve doubt, to reclaim vice, to strengthen weakness, and to perfect holiness². It will be his task to answer whether he has

hardly less strong in his work, *De Sacerdotio*, VI. in initio. Καὶ τὰ μὲν ἐνταῦθα τοιαῦτα, οἷάπερ ἤκουσας· τὰ δὲ ἐκεῖ πῶς οἶσμεν, ὅτ' αὖ καθ' ἕκαστον τῶν πιστευθέντων ἀναγκαζώμεθα τὰς εὐθύνας ὑπέχειν; οὐ γὰρ μέχρις αἰσχύνῃς ἢ ζημίας, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἰώριος ἐνδέχεται κύλασις· τὸ γὰρ 'Πείθεσθε τοῖς ἡγουμένοις ὑμῶν καὶ ὑπέκτετε ὅτι αὐτοὶ ἀγρυπνοῦσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ὑμῶν ὡς λόγον ἀποδῶσόντες' εἰ καὶ πρότερον εἶπον οὐδὲ νῦν σιωπήσομαι. Ὁ γὰρ φόβος ταύτης τῆς ἀπειλῆς συνεχῶς κατασείει μου τὴν ψυχὴν, &c.

¹ These are the words of Augustine, as quoted by Bishop Bull, I. p. 261.

² In addition to the passages before quoted, as to the variety

not only endeavoured to lay a good foundation by persuading men to forsake the sins of an evil world, and the sinful desires of an evil nature, but whether he has laboured unceasingly to form them to Christian purity, to a lowly, a contented, and resigned spirit, to a fervent thankfulness for the blessings of redemption, to a love of their God, and their brethren; whether he has endeavoured to raise them above the world, to exalt them to the divine image, to spiritualize their hearts and tempers, so that in God's good time they may be fit to ascend 'to Mount Zion and the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly of the first-born, to God the judge of all, to the spirits of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant¹.' And if, among those committed to him, there be some who, instead of ascending to those heights of glory, shall at last be consigned to the dread abode of vice and misery and woe, it will be his, especially, to answer whether, by every threat of vengeance and every offer of mercy, by earnestness in season and out of season, by exhortation, by warning, and by prayer, he has done his part to avert their awful doom, and is pure from their blood.

of methods to be pursued with different tempers, I would refer to a very admirable one in *Greg. Nazianz. Apol. Op. T. i. p. 13.*

¹ Heb. xii. 22—24.

And as this will be the nature of his account, so he cannot doubt of the strictness with which it will be required. If the soul of man be so precious and its loss so painful to the Eternal, that the Son of God, coming down from the glory he had before the world began, and shrouding his Godhead in mortal flesh, endured all that man's nature can endure in the evils of life and the struggles of death, in order that he might seek and save that which was lost ; who can doubt the awful strictness of the account to be required of them who are appointed by him to carry on the work of salvation, the dreadful vengeance on them who are guilty, by their neglect or their sin, of the loss of a soul ? ' Have always, therefore, in your remembrance, my brethren, how great a treasure is committed to your charge. For they are the sheep of Christ which he bought with his death, and for whom he shed his blood. The Church and congregation whom you serve is his body. And if it shall happen the same Church, or any member thereof, to take any hurt or hindrance by reason of your negligence, you know the greatness of the fault, and also the horrible punishment that must ensue¹ ;' you see, you must see, the devoted diligence which must be required to avert the evil, and its penalty and woe.

¹ Ordination Service.

These considerations I have set before you, my younger brethren, in order to show you the necessity of an earnest and entire devotion to your profession. You will have observed, doubtless, that I have omitted all notice of many other qualifications for the priesthood, as inferior in moment to that first and chiefest, though highly important in themselves. I might instance more especially the judgment and discretion with which our objects are to be carried into effect, and without which our zeal will perpetually be fruitless ; the constant and watchful guard which must be maintained over every infirmity of temper ; the Christian tenderness for conscientious difference ; the scrupulous desire to recognize purity of motive wherever it is to be found ; the anxiety to avoid every employment, and every amusement, which, though in itself perhaps not immoral, may appear unsuited to our calling, and so offend the weaker brethren, and lessen our usefulness¹. The wisdom, in short, of

¹ On the amusements of the Clergy, see Bishop Blomfield's Primary Charge at Chester, which should be carefully studied by the candidate for orders.—See also Archbishop Secker's First Charge to the Clergy of the Archdiocese of Canterbury, p. 234—241.

Bishop Jebb, in his Charge (Practical Theology, i. p. 392), has the following remarks: 'To speak my sentiments plainly (for in all my intercourse with you I shall be plain and simple), I do not see how a Clergyman, consistently with the sacredness and separation of his character and office, consistently with the

the serpent is to be united, in the exercise of our difficult and laborious task, with the harmlessness of the dove. But these things will follow, as their necessity is felt, in every case where the heart is deeply impressed with the solemnity of the obligation which lies upon it. And it is to the greater points, therefore, that I have ventured in my weakness to direct your attention, in order that they who are about to enter our profession in thoughtlessness, may perceive, that if they do so, they will be placed at once in a boundless ocean of the most

edification of the flock committed to his charge, or consistently with the vows which he has made at his ordination, can pursue the sports of the mountain or the field; can resort to the race-course or the theatre; can be found at the card-table or in the ball-room. In avowing these sentiments, I avow the sentiments which, from the earliest ages of the Church, have been maintained alike by the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers, and by the most distinguished and illustrious Churchmen of modern times. In these sentiments I have lived, and in these sentiments I hope to die, and, at the close of life, it will be to me a crown of rejoicing, if, through my humble instrumentality, any of you, my reverend brethren, shall be induced to become like-minded, and to consider, even in their most unguarded hours, what gravity and recollectedness are, at all times, and in all places, demanded of our sacred order.' There are some admirable passages to the same purpose as the other remarks in the text, in Bishop Hough's *Third Charge*, p. 44—46; in p. 62—64 (on charity to those that differ); and in the *Fourth Charge*, p. 85—88 (on the same subject).

solemn duties, surrounded by obligations which they cannot escape, and which, if unsatisfied, will cause their eternal ruin ; that they may feel that it is no light, no trifling, no amusing profession which they choose, but that its duties cannot be fully discharged without a relinquishment of the cares, the hopes, and the wishes which belong to worldly professions, and to worldly men.

To these representations I must add a caution, even to those who enter on the ministry with a better and higher feeling. I add it indeed in sorrow, but I add it in truth, and in justice. The young minister must be warned, that however high his aims, however high the dignity of his calling and of its objects, he must not expect in entering it, to find, at first, that unalloyed satisfaction which it would seem that purity and loftiness of purpose ought to bestow. The duties of the priestly office are far from being in all cases pleasing in themselves. To utter unpalatable truths ; to declare our disapprobation of the favourite habits of our neighbours, or, it may be, of our chosen associates and friends ; to encounter obloquy by condemning prevailing errors ; to teach where there is little leisure, and perhaps less inclination, to learn ; to hold up to the sinner the picture of his own mind, and drag forth his vices from their lurking-places, are tasks painful to any nature, to a timid and

delicate one almost overwhelming. And in other obvious respects the young minister will be beset by much that will offend, much that will bitterly pain him. The offence, indeed, and the bitterness, will increase in proportion to the height to which he has raised his standard of duty. It will be his lot to contend long, and sometimes unavailingly, in the struggle to subdue vulgar profligacy, to stimulate careless indifference, and to soften obstinate opposition. Often, oh ! how often, will he fear, in his hours of solitary communing with his own heart, that some of the evil he sees around him is the work of his own hand ; the fruit of his leaving undone what it was his business to do, or of his doing what every solemn tie of duty forbade¹.

But to return. As I have thus omitted to remind you of many important qualifications, so have I also voluntarily omitted all warnings against peculiar vices, as unfitted for this place. Ill suited, indeed, to it would be the language of that righteous indignation, which could alone justly characterize that worst of all bad men, a bad priest ; which could shame the profligate, the frivolous follower after unmeaning dissipation, the base and servile

¹ Some of the remarks at the commencement of this paragraph are, I think, to be found in substance in Gerard on the Pastoral Care, but I have no opportunity of referring to that Work for the page at this moment.

fawner for preferment, the greedy hunter after debasing gain, the hireling who has crept into the fold, not to nourish and feed the sheep, but to leave them to be stolen, killed, and destroyed¹.

If there be one bad heart among you, my younger brethren, one who knows that he is neither anxious to tame his passions, to subdue his avarice, nor to exalt his meanness, let him carry his passions, his avarice, and his meanness, to some profession where they will be less mischievous to others, less fatal to himself. Let him pause, ere he plant himself on the watch-towers of our Jerusalem; and, if he will enter, let him remember the day of account, remember the solemn truth we have set before him, that, as with the rest of his brethren, he has to give an account of his own soul, and to excuse, as he can, the sins of infirmity and frailty in the discharge of his duty, so when that task is done, it will be his lot to stand forth from the common crowd of sinners, and offer whatsoever plea he has, for the greater evils he has effected, for the sanctity of a holy calling sullied, the general influence of religion lessened, and the name of God, his Master, dishonoured and despised.

Do not think that I overcharge the picture, or present you an unreasonable view of the require-

¹ See the conclusion of Taylor's Consecration Sermon, Vol. vi. p. 322—327.

ments and the dangers of your profession ; do not be deluded by any low standard of duty which you may see others erect ; do not be induced by the thoughtlessness with which you see many enter on their profession, and the careless levity with which they exercise it, to believe that there is a safety for you in following their example. There is no difference in this respect, in the rule or its result, for the priest and the ordinary Christian. Each has to give account of his own conduct to his own Master ; he will be judged by his use of the talents committed to him, not by the abuse of which other men be guilty ; he will stand or fall, not by following the multitude in the path they have chosen, but by steadily pursuing that which his own heart and conscience dictates.

But neither let it be imagined, that while I draw this picture of your duties, I seek to represent our holy calling, as a calling either wholly, or even chiefly, of endurance, or suffering. God forbid ! He does not so desert his chosen ministers, nor deprive his faithful servants of their consolations and joy. His service, if faithfully undertaken, and devotedly followed, is perhaps that path of life, which, for our own happiness, we should choose and covet. But to be productive of happiness, it must be devotedly followed. It admits of no compromise with claims of a less exalted character than

its own ; no half service, no attempt to unite, with a spiritual calling, worldly objects, and worldly enjoyments. The unnatural union only destroys all result of happiness ; for the consciousness of a higher aim and nobler object produces dissatisfaction at the very pleasure derived from an inferior one, as surely as it is itself lowered and degraded in beauty and in excellence.

But in the heart of the priest devoted to his profession, there exist, even with all the labours and difficulties of which I have spoken, all the elements of the purest and highest happiness which a frail and infirm nature and a transitory state admit. For first of all, he is a Christian, and that doctrine according to godliness by which he labours to form other men's tempers, will exert its holy influence on his own. While he teaches others to reform and sanctify their hearts, to struggle against temptation, and to attain the Christian victory and the Christian peace which follow, he too shall learn the lesson and reap the fruit. In the work, indeed, of purifying and correcting his own heart, he must labour abundantly, both from the constant direction of his thoughts and wishes to heavenly objects, and his conviction of their superiority over every earthly one, and also from the fixed persuasion that unhallowed hands and an unsanctified heart, are alike unfit for his sacred calling. And as he

labours abundantly in the task of purifying his own heart, and elevating his own thoughts, so he will partake abundantly in the peace and joy which Christian purity and spirituality confer.

The objects, too, on which he is employed, are such as, above all others, to satisfy and delight. Others may grieve when they remember the frivolous or the worldly objects to which they have devoted high talents and lengthened years; but what besides satisfaction and joy can he feel, whose duty and whose glory it is to preach Christ crucified, and who directs every thought, wish, and desire, to the purity, perfection, and happiness, of immortal beings? What can produce peace like the calm and continued pursuit of a virtuous purpose, the conscience satisfied, and God obeyed? There must be peace within, and even without: when right intentions are suspected, or when hearty endeavours to reclaim the sinner are unsuccessful, there is still the tranquil consolation which arises from the conviction of having done our part, and neglected nothing which could check vice, and prevent misery¹.

¹ Sow thy seed in the morning, and in the evening withhold not thy hand; for thou knowest not which will prosper, saith the Wise Man, Eccl. xi. 6.

² As the moralist speaks of benefits, a man must lose many words among the people that some one may not be lost. I am

Nor will those exertions be always vain, for we shall often see, with humble delight, that we have

all things to all, saith our Apostle, that I may gain some, 1 Cor. ix. 20. And though in continuing diligent, thy diligence should still continue fruitless to others, to thee it shall not be so. Thy God is a discreet Lord; as he hath not put events into thy hands he will not exact them at thy hands. Thou art to be accountable for planting and watering, but not for the increase; be not wanting in thy task, and thou shalt not want thy recompense. Shouldst thou be forced to say with the Prophet, I have laboured in vain, and spent my strength for nought, in regard of success, yet if thou hast laboured, so laboured as to spend thy strength in that service, thou must add with him, Yet surely my judgment is with the Lord, and my work with my God.' Isa. xlix. 4.—Leighton's Works, Vol. iii. p. 477.

'We who are called to labour in the vineyard must not fondly flatter ourselves with the expectation of seeing much fruit grow from our culture and pains; that must be looked for in a coming generation of men, in whom virtue and knowledge have been planted early and grown up proportionably. But we may safely indulge ourselves in that most comfortable reflection, that our works will follow us; that whilst we are endeavouring to form a tender mind to every thing that is right and good, and may not discover the greatest likelihood of its answering our care, our precepts may fix themselves, and God be working with us to produce in his good time a chosen instrument for his service, and a bright example to the world. This may fall out when we are gone and forgotten; but he who watered the plant which God has been pleased to bless with so great increase, will be remembered by him to have done the duty of a faithful servant, and be in no danger of losing his reward.'—Bishop Hough's Third Charge, p. 57.

[' The

been the instruments of promoting God's glory, and man's happiness, of subduing evil and of saving

'The faithful Minister counts the success of his Ministry the greatest preferment. Yet herein God hath humbled many painful pastors, in making them to be clouds of rain, not over Arabia the Happy, but over the Stonie or Desert—so that they may complain with the herdsman in the poet, *Hei mihi, quam pingui macer est mihi taurus in arvo!* Yet such pastors may comfort themselves that great is their reward with God in heaven, who measures it not by their success, but endeavours. Besides, though they see it not, their people may feel benefit by their ministry; yet, the preaching of the Word in some places is like the planting of woods, where, though no profit is received for twenty years together, it comes afterwards. And grant that God honours thee not to build his temple in thy parish, yet thou mayst with David provide metals and materials for Solomon thy successor to build it with.'—Fuller's Holy State, B. ii. ch. 9. § 14.

‘Συ γὰρ εἰκόθου τα κατὰ συντόν· τὸν βίον φημὶ καὶ τὸν λόγον· ταῦτα ἀπαιτῶ παρα σοῦ, καὶ ὠφελοῦντι μὲν συνησθήσομαι· μὴ ὠφελήσαντα δὲ οὐκ ἀτιμιάσω, ἀλλὰ καὶ στεφανώσω.’—Isid. Pelus. IV. 18.

The following are the beautiful reflections of Leo the Great on the same subject:—‘*Miror autem dilectionem tuam in tantum scandalorum quacunque occasione nascentium adversitate turbari; ut vacationem ab Episcopatus laboribus optare te dicas, et malle in silentio atque otio vitam degere quam in his quæ tibi commissæ sunt permanere.* Dicente vero Domino, “*Beatus qui perseveraverit usque in finem,*” unde beata erit perseverantia nisi de virtute patientiæ? Nam secundum Apostolicam prædicationem, omnis qui voluerit hic vivere in Christo Jesu, persecutionem patietur. Quæ non in eo tantum computanda est quod contra Christianam pietatem aut ferro aut ignibus agitur,

souls. It is ours too, in the day of distress and of anguish, to soothe the troubled spirit, to comfort the mourner, 'to comfort them which are in any trouble, by the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God,' to bind up the broken-hearted, and to pour into the wounded heart that peace which the world can neither give nor take away. And in the affectionate and heartfelt gratitude of those, whom, by God's blessing, his minister will save, and those whom he will comfort, he will find a source of happiness higher than the gratifications of ambition, and purer than the triumphs

aut quibuscumque suppliciis ; cum persecutionum sævitiam suppleant et dissimilitudines morum et contumaciæ inobedientium, et malignarum tela linguarum ; quibus conflictationibus cum omnia semper Ecclesiæ membra pulsentur, et nulla piorum portio hic a tentatione sit libera, ita ut periculis nec otia careant, nec labores, quis inter fluctus maris navem diriget, si gubernator absit ? quis ab insidiis luporum oves custodiet, si pastoris cura non vigilet ? quis denique latronibus obsistet et furibus, si speculatorem in prospectu explorationis locatum, ab intentione sollicitudinis amor quietis abducat ? Permanendum ergo in opere est credito et in labore suscepto.'—Leo, Epist. ad Rusticum, Ep. Narb. p. 474.

Let me, in conclusion, refer to an exquisite Poem on this subject by Mr. Keble ; his Verses for Tuesday in Whitsun Week. His Christian Year is a most acceptable gift to all Christians : and to the Christian priest an invaluable one. We may be proud of possessing, in these days, one who to such delicacy of poetical thought joins a spirit of such pure and fervent devotion.

of intellect. They bless him, and he shall be blest¹!

Neither is his happiness less in an intellectual view. For it is Christian discipline, which, by subduing the passions that prevent the entry of truth, brings man into sympathy with all that is great and elevating in the moral and intellectual world; and it is the Christian tranquillity of a subdued and regulated mind which enables us to appreciate its value, far better than that wordy and more intellectual wisdom, which, ever desirous of victory rather than of truth, and ever busy in surveying the external relation of things, overlooks their intrinsic worth, and enjoys not their real beauty².

But I have been speaking only of the natural effects of Christian habits and Christian thoughts. There is something yet higher and yet better beyond. For that blessed Spirit who watches over

¹ 'What a glorious testimony will it be before the throne of Christ on the last day, when so many souls shall stand forth and say, This was the hand which snatched us out of the fire; this tongue was to us a tree of life; his reproofs and convictions awakened us; his exhortations persuaded us; his consolations revived us; his wisdom counselled us; his example guided us unto this glory.'—Bishop Reynolds, Sermon xxv. Works, Vol. v. p. 406 (ed. 1826).

² This subject is fully treated in Jeremy Taylor's Sermon called 'Via Intelligentiæ,' already referred to.

and co-operates with the endeavours of his faithful Ministers, will shed his own consolations, and his own joy, over their bosoms. He will, indeed, be their Comforter, that they faint not, so that ‘when troubled on every side, they shall not be distressed; though perplexed, not in despair; though cast down, not destroyed¹.’ He will tranquillize and calm them in all the storms of life, comfort them in its worst afflictions, and be their exceeding great reward, alike in the struggle through time, and the passage to eternity; renewing the inward man day by day, pointing their view to the house not made with hands, and to the season when ‘their ministry shall pass into empire, their watchfulness into fruition, and their labour into rest².’

¹ 2 Cor. iv. 8, 9.

² Jeremy Taylor’s Works, vi. p. 327. I subjoin the words of Leo the Great on the subject of this paragraph:—‘Quid tam insolitum, tam pavendum, quam labor fragili, sublimitas humili, dignitas non merenti? Et tamen non desperamus neque deficimus, quia non de nobis, sed de illo præsumimus qui operatur in nobis.’—Leo I. Pap. Serm. II. in Ann. Assumpt. ejusdem ad Summi Pont. munus. (Opp. p. 4.)

And again, ‘In hac ergo materia trepidationis, quæ nobis esset dependendæ fiducia servitutis, nisi non dormitaret qui custodit Israel, et qui discipulis suis ait, “Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi,” nisi dignaretur non solum custos ovium, sed ipsorum pastor esse pastorum?’—Leo

Compare this comfort, my brethren, with the prospects and the hopes of the worldly and thoughtless priest. Look, I would especially beseech you, to that period of life, when even the unbeliever¹ confesses that a browner shade is cast on his declining years by the abbreviation of time, and the failure of hope ; when even the heathen moralist feels that there is something from within required to support and to sustain, to give dignity to the frailty of age, and cheerfulness and comfort to the long and weary hours of unoccupied infirmity ; when, as far as relates to our mortal nature, and mortal state, all forward-looking thoughts are closed by the grave, which is opening for us, and all mortal hopes are departing from those dreary days when there is no pleasure in them. Tell me, I beseech you, what must then be the thoughts of the priest who has deemed lightly of his office, and lowered its dignity, by his own neglect, or his own carelessness ? What is there with him of the thoughts which cheer and comfort the declining years of other and better men, by setting before them the remembrance of a course of honour and of usefulness, of duties performed, and good effected ?

Pap. Fragm. Serm. in Anniv. Ass. suæ ad Summ. Pont. munus.
(Opp. p. 273.)

¹ Gibbon's Misc. Works, Vol. i. p. 275. 8vo. edit.

What is there with him but this, that he commenced his course by entering, from the mere hope of lucre¹, on a profession which he disliked, or lightly

¹ ‘Be warm in zeal and indifferent in thy temporalities; for he that is zealous in temporals and cold in the spiritual, he that doeth the accessories of his calling by himself, and the principal by his deputies, he that is present at the feast of sheep-shearing and puts others to feed the flock, hath no sign at all upon him of a good shepherd. “It is not fit for us to leave the word of God and serve tables,” said the Apostles; and if it be a less worthy office to serve the tables even of the poor to the diminution of our care in the dispensation of God’s word, it must needs be an unworthy employment to leave the word of God and to attend the rich and superfluous furniture of our own tables.’—Jeremy Taylor, vi. p. 325.

‘One thing they must mainly take heed of, if they aspire to a holy familiarity with God—earthly-mindedness. If no servant of the God of Mammon can serve this God in point of common service, how much less can he be fit for an eminent employment, as an embassy, and enjoy the intimacy requisite for that employment? These messengers should come near the life of angels, always beholding the face of the Father of light; but if their affections be engaged to the world, their faces will still be that way. Fly high they may sometimes in some speculations of their own, but like the eagle, for all their soaring, their eye will still be upon some prey, some carrion here below.’—Leighton, iii. p. 473.

‘Ingenti periculo, sacerdotes, qui Ecclesiæ oculi sunt, negotiis sæculi, curis pecuniæ et familiarum, rerum incrementis, et convivorum luxibus occupantur. Ecclesiæ enim lumen sunt, *i. e.* corporis oculi. Et si lumen ipsum avaritiæ aut lasciviæ oculis

respected; that he continued his career by neglecting all its duties but those to which the law compelled him; and that so he closes it, as he deserves, without self-respect, without respect from man, or favour from God? He has called himself God's servant, and has stood in his place, and worn his garb, and received his earthly reward, but he has

nocte tenebrescat, corpori, i. e. Ecclesiæ, cui per naturam suam tenebræ sunt, quantæ insuper tenebræ de exemplo tenebrosi luminis invehentur!—Hilar. on 138 Ps. 34. p. 520. C.

‘Overgreat solicitude and contrivance for advancing ourselves will always make impressions to our prejudice, let our condition be ever so low; though deservedly much stronger impressions, in proportion as it is higher. We shall be thought to have no attention, but that of which we discover too much, and the truth is, we cannot serve two masters. Nor will it be sufficient that we avoid the charge of immoderately desiring more, unless we avoid also that of selfishness in the management of that we have already.’—Archbishop Secker’s 1st Charge to the Clergy of the diocese of Oxford, p. 35. 5th ed. Again, ‘Nothing gives greater or juster offence than to see a clergyman intent upon hoarding, or luxurious, or splendid, instead of being charitable. Few, indeed, of our order have much to spare, and many have cause to wish for a more plentiful subsistence, yet even these, and much more the better preferred, if they are earnest seekers and importunate solicitors for promotion, lower their character grievously; and such as use indirect means to obtain it, are often providentially disappointed; or though they succeed, always dishonour themselves, and never do much good to others.’—Archbishop Secker’s 2nd Charge to the Clergy of Canterbury, p. 249. 5th ed.

done none of God's work in the world. He has called himself the minister of joy and health and salvation to his brethren, but where are the tokens of his ministry? where are the feeble knees which he has strengthened, where the drooping heart which he has taught to sing for joy, where the soul which he has saved? What can he see but the sinner unconverted, the ignorant left in his ignorance, God not glorified, his kingdom not filled?

But I am speaking only of a careless priest. What shall be said of the declining years of a sinful one? What can hope suggest, what consolation can he minister to the stings of his conscience? Can he say that he was ignorant, and so fell into the snare of sin, and of Satan? But it was his business to teach the law of God, and shall he plead that he knew it not? Shall he say that the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, the temptations of riches and honour, which slay their thousands day by day, slew him also? But did he not of his own free choice vow a vow to the God of Jacob, that he renounced the world, and forgot and forsook it, and resigned the treasures of earth for the higher treasures of heaven? Nay! whatsoever other men may urge to soothe the terrors of their age, whatsoever they may plead in prayer of ignorance or infirmity, to him who knows whereof we are made, and remembers that

we are but dust, that cannot be pleaded to God by the profligate priest, nor minister consolation to his declining years.

And if, from his declining years, we turn to his dying hour, what spectacle will it present? Shall I speak of the agony arising from the remembrance of souls lost by his carelessness, which, but for his carelessness, might have shone as angels in the courts of the living God, but shall now rise against him in condemnation from the house of woe? Shall I speak of the most solemn duty neglected, the most awful charge forsaken? Who would draw the picture, who would not shrink from surveying it? Let us draw a veil over its horrors, in the certainty, that earth has no sight in woe or in terror, like the death-bed of the faithless servant of God, the careless shepherd of the souls of his brethren, who is going to his own place, to receive from the Master he has dishonoured the portion which he has righteously earned: and let us all who are, or are about to become¹ ministers of God, pray, from

¹ I cannot resist transcribing the following prayer of the great St. Basil:—‘ Διὸ καὶ ἀντιφθέγγομαί σου τὴν ὁσιότητα, παρακαλῶν τὴν συνήθη παράκλησιν, μὴ διαλιπεῖν σε εὐχόμενον ὑπὲρ τῆς ἐλευνῆς μου ζωῆς· μήποτε τῇ φαντασίᾳ τοῦ βίου τούτου καταβαπτισθεὶς, ἐπιλάβωμαι μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ ἐγείροντος ἀπὸ γῆς πτωχόν· ἔπαρσιν δέ τινα παθὼν εἰς κρίμα ἐμπέσω τοῦ δαιμόλου· ῥαθυμήσας δὲ τῆς οἰκονομίας κυθεύων ὑπὸ τοῦ δεσπότου καταληφθῶ· ἢ καὶ διὰ τῶν βλαβερῶν ἔργων προστιθεὶς, καὶ τύπτων τὴν συνείδησιν

our inmost hearts, and on our bended knees, that such a dying hour, such a place, and such a portion, may not be ours.

τῶν συνδούλων, ἥ καὶ μετὰ τῶν μεθυόντων γινόμενος, ἐν τῇ δικαιοκρισίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ πάθω τὰ τοῖς πονηροῖς τῶν οἰκονόμων ἡπειλημένα. Πυρακαλῶ οὖν σε ἐπὶ πασῇ προσευχῇ δέεσθαι τοῦ Θεοῦ νήφειν ἡμᾶς ἐν πάσιν· ἵνα μὴ αἰσχύνῃ γινώμεθα καὶ ὄνειδος τῷ ὀνόματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἐν τῇ ἀποκαλύψει τῶν κρυπτῶν τῆς καρδίας ἡμῶν, κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην ἡμέραν τῆς ἐπιφανείας τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—S. Basil. Ep. 213. Opp. T. iii. p. 320. ed. Bened.

In conclusion, I would earnestly recommend to the candidates for orders, the conclusion of a Sermon by Bishop Bull, to which I have already referred more than once, ‘The Priest’s Office difficult and dangerous.’ It is, probably, the most powerful, I may say the most awful, representation of the prospects of a careless priest which exists in either this or any other language. Thus too, Stillingfleet, in the conclusion of his Ordination Sermon (Works, Vol. i. p. 375, fol. ed. 1710). ‘The salvation of men’s souls depends very much on the care of those who are to be their guides to heaven. For if they lead them astray, whom they think they are bound to follow, their destruction will be unavoidable. When the blind lead the blind, they both fall into the ditch; but yet the blind leader falls first, and falls heaviest and deepest, and the other falls upon him and sinks him lower. It is a sad thing to have the guilt of other men’s sins as well as our own to answer for, when by our wilful neglect of our own duty, or by our examples, or by our erroneous doctrines, we prove the occasion of damning those souls which were committed to our charge to conduct them to heaven. The care of souls would be a dreadful thing indeed, if we were to answer for all the miscarriages of the people committed to our charge. But if they are such as happen through the voluntary and plain

omission of the duty laid on us, or our being accessory to their commission of them, they may be justly charged on our account. With what care and caution then ought all persons to enter upon so weighty, so holy, so tremendous a charge ! What preparation of mind is necessary to consider it ! What fasting and prayer to obtain God's assistance in it ! What wisdom, and piety, and resolution to discharge it ! But let us not be disheartened ; we serve a gracious Master, and in the best employment ; and although we may meet with many difficulties within and without, and on all sides, yet let us " be stedfast, unmoveable," ' &c.

APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

Expediency of a Church government.

THE two following statements from Bishop Reynolds and Dr. Balguy comprise whatever is most essential to show the advantages of a regular Church government; and I have purposely selected these writers, because neither of them can be accused of maintaining what are called high-church views.

Bishop Reynolds has argued the case very closely and well. Indeed it was reasonable to suppose that the arguments for the *expediency* of a Church government would be duly appreciated by a party, many of whom did not conceive that the particular form to which they found it expedient, or judged it their duty to conform, had any higher foundation than expediency.—See his XXVth Sermon. Works, Vol. v. p. 388—409, ed. 1826.

His argument stands nearly thus:—

1. That which God hath appointed as an office in his Church is to be adjudged *necessary*. God hath, by his special institution, appointed pastors and teachers in his Church, whose function the Scripture owneth as an office—therefore they are to be acknowledged necessary. (See 1 Tim. iii. 1; Col. iv. 17; 1 Cor. xii. 28; Eph. iv. 11; Matt. ix. 38; Col. i. 7; Acts xx. 28.)

2. Necessary ordinances presuppose necessary officers to administer them. Christ hath appointed necessary ordinances to be to the end of the world administered; therefore the officers

who are to administer them are necessary likewise. He did not appoint a work to be done, and leave it to the wide world who should do it, but committed the ministry of reconciliation to stewards and ambassadors, by him selected for that purpose.

3. That which was instituted for necessary ends, so long as those ends continue, must be necessary likewise. The office for the ministry was instituted for necessary ends, which do and will still continue; therefore the ministry by which they are to be promoted is still to continue. But it may be objected, others may promote these ends as well as ministers; all believers are commanded to comfort, support, edify one another; therefore no need of such an office for the doing of them. We answer—‘ These great works are not done with the same authority, efficacy, certainty, or order, by a private hand as by public officers.’

1. Not with the same authority. A learned lawyer may resolve a man’s case as truly as a judge; but when he hath the sentence declared by the judge, this doth more assure and quiet him, because it is a sentence not only of truth, but of authority. (See Tit. ii. 15.)

2. Not with the same efficacy, for the Lord hath made them *able* ministers (2 Cor. iii. 6); furnished them with power for edification (2 Cor. xiii. 16); annexed a special promise of blessing to their service (Matt. xxviii. 20); the Gospel ministered by them is not in word only, but in power (1 Thess. i. 5); not declarative only but operative, they being therein workers together with God (1 Cor. iii. 9; 2 Cor. vi. 1).

3. Not with the same certainty; for how can it be expected that the cases and conditions of particular consciences should be so well looked after by private men, who have callings of their own to divert them, as by those whose whole work it is to oversee the souls committed to their charge, to whom they may, in every case of difficulty, resort for counsel? Or how can I expect ordinarily as full satisfaction from a private bro-

ther, as from one whose duty it is to give himself wholly to these things, whose constant business it is to give attendance, &c. &c. (1 Tim. iv. 13—16.)

4. Not with the same order. God is in all his works, much more in his Church, a God of order (1 Cor. xiv. 33). If the Apostles themselves found it difficult to attend the Word of God, and tables (Acts vi. 2), it cannot but be much more difficult for private brethren to attend their own domestical callings and the public concerns of the Church. If a great Apostle said, 'Who is sufficient for these things?' shall we judge private persons fit enough for them? If in the body, God hath set several members for several uses, shall we think so weighty, difficult, and important a service as publishing the glad tidings of salvation, should be intrusted at large in every hand, and no peculiar officers set apart for the dispensing of it?

He goes on to argue the necessity of the office from the titles given to it in Scripture, and the importance which those titles imply¹; from the fact that the Apostles took order for the service of the Church, by appointing certain officers; and from the constant prescription of all ages and countries in favour of a Ministry.

In another Sermon (the 23rd) he again argues the necessity of a Ministry, first from the authority of Christ, who instituted it, and from the wants of Christ's Church, which could not be taught without it.—See Works, Vol. v. p. 345. Before passing to Balguy, I may just mention that Barrow (Vol. iii. Sermon. xxiv.) has put the points of this argument with great closeness and force.

The arguments suggested by reason in favour of a regular

¹ This argument was perhaps a favourite one in Bishop Reynolds' time. It is given at length in the *Jus Divinum Ministerii Evangelici*, published by the Provincial Assembly of London, 1654, pp. 8, 9.

Church government, are fully stated by Balguy in two Consecration Sermons, preached in Lambeth Chapel (Balguy's Discourses, Vol. i. p. 76—113). They are much as follows: By a Church, says Balguy, we are to understand a number of persons agreeing to unite in public assemblies for the performance of religious duties. And it is easier to consider the case of a single congregation first. They agree to meet, because in a public assembly the offices of religion are more constantly, properly, and effectually performed. But these advantages would be lost, if every member might speak and act as he pleased. By such an exercise of individual liberty, regularity, propriety, and effect, would be obviously diminished or lost. The performance of the offices of religion must therefore be committed to certain persons and regulated in a certain manner, on both which points the society must judge for itself. There will then be a regular time of performance—there will be no competition or confusion, and much probability that the offices will be well performed. For they who are appointed must make it their business to learn and teach religion. And if their time is thus taken up, they must be paid by the congregation.

But still farther, the manner of performing the offices of religion must be laid down, otherwise the ministers might be capricious, and pursue different plans both as to form and doctrine, whence dreadful evils would arise, as is clear from considering how few are able to judge for themselves, and how constantly parties would arise.

From these considerations arises what is called church-authority. The society has power to appoint to the ministry, and therefore to exclude from it. No man then can undertake the office without an appointment, or oppose those who have received one. If he does, he cannot remain a member, he is excommunicated. And so the prescribing one form implies the

excluding all others. The minister cannot use a different form from that appointed, without usurping the power of the whole society, which was never committed to him. And this would make him liable to deprivation. The society may determine all these matters by plurality of votes, or may choose representatives to arrange them.

Next let us look to the case of many congregations united into one body. They unite because the ends proposed will be pursued by means of union more wisely and more uniformly, because there will be consultation, because there will be concurrence of particular assemblies in the resolutions taken by the whole community. In a small community, for example, it may not be easy to find proper ministers, nor even persons able to choose them. But in a large community, there will be a larger supply of good ministers, and such a community must act by representatives, who will be able to make a proper choice. In civil society, the administration of government at least is delegated. And so it must be in the Church. Small bodies or single men must govern it and choose proper persons for ministers. Again, as to the selection of proper forms and manners of performing the offices of religion, the larger the body which thinks on the subject, the greater the hope of a good selection and of nothing being neglected; or if the society delegates its power here too, more care and diligence will be used by those to whom the management of a business, in which so many are interested, is entrusted.

Consistency and uniformity also are of great benefit to the interests of religion. For in the common course of things, difference is too often followed by doubt and discord.

It must, however, be observed, that a Church thus framed cannot support her power by civil sanctions, and can only take away what she has given. Nor is there any thing to oblige either individuals or congregations to continue in union. Only

they should be careful not to separate unless the interests of religion and virtue appear to require it, because the evils of discord are great.

Last of all we must look to the alteration produced in the whole affair by the interference of the civil magistrate. Religion becomes a dangerous instrument in the hands of the selfish and factious. And in this view Church authority should be under the control of the civil governor, and religious assemblies should be under his inspection and subject to his rules. The best way is to vest the supreme power, civil and ecclesiastical, in the hands of the same person. We have seen that the Church need not act collectively, but may delegate its power; and when we remember how much it concerns the public peace that the civil governor should have the power of regulating religion, he seems to be the proper person to whom the delegation should be made. Of course, his other occupations render him unfit to be the minister of religion. But it is his business to superintend all men and professions for the common good; and he can do this more effectually by having the superintendence of religion. From the supremacy of the civil magistrate arises the provision of a legal maintenance of the ministers of religion.

It would be desirable that all members of the same commonwealth should profess the same religion; but if that cannot be, the magistrate must protect not the best, but the largest sect, and tolerate the others.

This is the substance of Balguy's first Sermon; and cold and lifeless as this view of the subject undoubtedly is, the reasonings which it contains appear conclusive as to the advantages of Church authority, and the necessity of its existence; the necessity, I mean, even if no command from God be supposed to exist; for it will be observed, that he ASSUMES that the society is left to itself in every way, both as to the choice of ministers and the regulation of worship.

The second Sermon does not appear to me equal to the first. It is divided into two parts ; in the first Balguy shows the necessity for obedience to Church authority in ministers, and in the second the duty of conformity in the people. In the first part he directs his argument against those ministers who presume to disobey Church authority on three pretences ; 1, that they have an authority above law ; 2, that their obedience to human governors must be limited by the dictates of religion ; or 3, that they are inspired. Now in the first of these three divisions, it seems to me very singular that he should overlook, as he does, the broad distinction between the commission of the Minister and the constitution of Church government. He argues thus :

It is pretended that the clergy have their commission from God, that the Church is independent on the State, or superior to it, and that princes ought to receive laws from priests. Persons who so say, should remember, that, in every proper sense of the words, the ministers of the State, as well as of the Church, receive their commissions from God : for it is his will that civil as well as religious offices should be properly discharged, for which end authority is necessary. But in both cases, the persons who prescribe and execute the laws must be of human appointment. ‘ Whatever authority is employed in the service of religion, whether subordinate or supreme, may, without presumption, be referred to God, from whom all just power is derived. But the actual exercise of it by particular men, is founded only on consent, and whatever part of it is delegated to inferior ministers, is conveyed to them by the act of their superiors, and only in such form and manner as the law has appointed. If they go one step beyond this, they act without any authority at all, either from God or men.’ Such a method of arguing the question it is not easy to approve. Balguy had no right thus to confound those who plead for a Divine commission to the ministry with those who think that the ministry are to prescribe laws to the

State. They are an order constituted for spiritual purposes, and with spiritual privileges only ; and as ministers they can claim no sort of right to interfere in temporal matters.

Nor can I see the advantage of this unjust representation of the views of those who believe that the ministry is not a human appointment, but one instituted by the command of God. For they have an answer quite as full and as pertinent as Balguy's to those who reason like the persons he is opposing. They would say, that although God has indeed ordained a ministry, yet he has left all the other details of Church government, clearly necessary as they are to the well-being of his Church, to human care. And by this, as well as by the obvious reflection that the God of order could never intend by any of his ordinances to introduce confusion and misrule into the world, it is sufficiently clear that the powers given in the ministry are not unlimited powers. Without those powers, indeed, we contend that no man can become the minister of God ; but we do not contend that with them he can do whatever he pleases. He is still bound by the same laws of common sense and of conscience as other men, and must therefore evidently be obliged, in the exercise of his powers, to remember that they could never be meant for any thing but the good of the Church, never meant therefore to enable him to despise any justly-constituted authorities, either temporal or ecclesiastical. Nay, in the ministry itself, the difference between the higher and lower classes alone shows the duty of obedience in the ministry at large to their superiors.

Balguy's answer to the second pretence is a very just one. If we are not, says he, at liberty conscientiously to execute the trust reposed in us, we may lay it down : no good can be done by the minister of God refusing all obedience to his superiors, and under a pretence of obeying the dictates of religion, setting their authority at nought, and trampling on his own solemn

engagements and the rights of society. As to the third pretence, Balguy very rightly considers that it requires no answer. He then goes on to establish the necessity of a minister adhering strictly to the prescribed Liturgy, &c.

Bishop Hobart has put the matter very shortly, and well, (First Charge, 1815, p. 6,) ‘ Apart from its divine origin, the office of the ministry is connected with the very existence of religion. There never was and there never can be a religion without a priesthood ; Christianity consists of doctrines, of precepts, of sanctions, and of rites and ordinances ; there must be, therefore, an order of men set apart for the purpose of explaining its doctrines, of enforcing its precepts, of unfolding its sanctions, and of administering its rites and ordinances : the origin, therefore, of the Christian ministry must have been human if it had not been divine.’

No. II.

Proof of the calling of the Apostles.

‘ PROFESSOR SCHLEIERMACHER delivers it as his decided opinion, (p. 92,) that no solemn calling or ordination of the Apostles ever took place ; for (1) he contends that the author never intended here to relate any thing of the sort, and (2) while he allows that St. Mark “ most certainly” says that “ Christ really ordained the twelve” on this occasion, he explains this awkward fact by saying, that Mark’s narrative is taken from what now stands in Luke ; and that “ he has only to say, that Mark was probably the first person who misunderstood it !” Now, first of all, what is to justify this arbitrary assumption as to Mark having borrowed his account from Luke’s narrative ? There is no verbal agreement, at least, between them ; and the only reason offered by Professor Schleiermacher for thinking that St. Mark’s information is not derived from his own inquiry is, that the order of

events at this part of his Gospel does not appear to the Professor to be in any keeping. We need hardly observe how slight a ground of objection this is, even if well-grounded, and how exceedingly liable to be exaggerated by the operation of mere fancy, unless the want of probability be gross and glaring. But next, Professor Schleiermacher assumes not only that St. Mark had seen, altered, and spoiled *some* existing documents, but that he had seen the compilation standing in this part of St. Luke, and that he mixes this up in a confused and unnatural way with St. Matthew's narrative. Now it cannot be too often repeated, that although we may fairly endeavour to account for difficulties in any work under examination by *attempting* to trace the way in which the information contained in it was gained, yet to assume the success of that attempt in a matter affecting the writer's credit is quite unreasonable, and is, in fact, assuming the very point in dispute. But we will allow to Professor Schleiermacher, if he pleases, that St. Mark did take his information from St. Luke, and will confidently ask again, whether it is probable, we had almost said possible, that he should have misunderstood him? If, indeed, a man under St. Mark's circumstances, living at his time, and enjoying his advantages, did not know the fact whether the Apostles were called or not,—if he could, by any document, be betrayed into a false assertion as to so important a matter of fact, or be so careless as not to inquire,—if such suppositions be admissible, what possible value can we attach to his or to any Gospel, nay, to any contemporary testimony on a matter of history?

‘But let us pass to the grounds on which Professor Schleiermacher's assertion as to St. Luke's meaning is founded. The words of the original are (Luke vi. 13—17), καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο ἡμέρα, προσεφώνησε τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκλεξάμενος ὑπ' αὐτῶν δώδεκα, οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε, (then follow their names) καὶ καταβὰς μετ' αὐτῶν, ἔστη ἐπὶ τόπου πεδινοῦ. “Now

these words," says Professor Schleiermacher, "cannot possibly express a great, solemn, and very important fact, because ἐκλεξάμενος is evidently separated from ὠνόμασε, (the latter being referred to an entirely different epoch, however we translate the phrase; whereas, if a connexion between them had been meant, it must have run ἐκλεξάμενος δώδεκα καὶ ὀνομάσας αὐτοὺς ἀποστόλους,) and stands closely connected with καταβὰς between προσεφώνησε and ἔστη." "Would such an act," he asks, "in a free description, of which conciseness is not the prevailing character, have been confined to a parenthesis?" In answer, we must beg to say, that the criticism on the words is quite futile, except so far as this, that the expression suggested by Professor Schleiermacher would undoubtedly be more easy and natural. But we are amazed at finding that he thence argues that it *must* have been used. He says that ὠνόμασε must be referred to a different epoch, whether we translate, "whom also he had before called Apostles," or, "whom also he afterwards called Apostles." But we would beg to ask if the writer meant to say, "whom also he then named Apostles," (allowing, as we have done, that the phrase is more awkward than that suggested by Professor Schleiermacher,) what other part of the verb he could use?

'But again, even on our view of the Gospels, considering them, that is to say, as drawn up for the purpose of giving a connected account of the most important transactions and doctrines of our Lord, the argument from the parenthetical way of noticing this great act is of trifling weight; for it is almost a characteristic of the Gospels to relate the most important facts and the most astonishing miracles, we had almost said carelessly, but certainly, with the most entire simplicity and the most entire

¹ 'There is a book called "Ueber die Quellen des Evangeliums des Marcus," by a disciple of Schleiermacher's called Saunier, (Berlin, 1825,) in which the same objections are repeated.'

absence of all attempts to produce effect. It is most extraordinary too that this argument should have been made by a writer who considers the Gospel of Luke as a compilation of narratives drawn up by different persons and for different objects; for unless the particular object of the narrative embodied in this part of the Gospel had been the calling of the Apostles, there could be no reason why the writer should not notice, in transitu, this or any other important fact, not being his main object, and hasten on to that, whatever it might be. But still farther, Professor S. positively asserts, (p. 93,) that a collector of historical materials who inquired on the spot, would scarcely have received, any where, any other answer than that the peculiar relation of the Twelve assumed its subsequent form gradually and of itself. This answer, he thinks, is given by the silence of Matthew and John, and is in itself the most probable state of the case, for it must have depended very much on external circumstances, whether any one could enter into this relation. The argument from the silence of Matthew is not quite fairly stated, for so far from his being silent, he mentions (ch. xi.) that Jesus called his twelve Apostles (whose names are there recited as in Luke and Mark) to him on a particular occasion, gave them miraculous powers, and after this solemn ordination, sent them forth to preach. St. John never even enumerates the disciples, and therefore little can be inferred from his silence; but when he does speak, he speaks, as we shall see below, very awkwardly for Professor Schleiermacher's theory. Then, as to the probability of the matter, so differently do probabilities strike different minds, (and so vague, consequently, is the judgment to be formed from them,) that to many it would appear not only probable, but highly probable, that at the outset of a scheme which was to be entrusted to human hands, its Divine Author would assuredly attach to himself certain immediate friends to whom he might, in some degree,

explain his views and wishes, and whose instrumentality he might use in accomplishing them. And in this particular case, it is quite obvious to inquire why there was a definite number of followers, unless something more positive than mere chance or convenience, depending on external circumstances, dictated their number.

‘But Professor Schleiermacher asks whether, “if Christ really by an act of his pleasure had called the Twelve, it would be possible satisfactorily to vindicate his wisdom from the objection that men, evidently more distinguished than many of the Twelve, made their appearance after his death too soon not to have been of the number of his immediate disciples¹?” Evidently more distinguished! If Professor Schleiermacher supposes Christ to have been a mere man, would he really at this distance of time either presume to judge of the wisdom of a choice, of all the circumstances of which he must be and is wholly ignorant, or build any argument on his own fancies on such a subject? “But the goodness of Jesus in calling Judas, and so disposing of his soul,” says Professor Schleiermacher, “could not be vindicated, while the difficulty is less, if there was no particular call on his side:” an observation to which we can by no means assent; for he who knowingly permits another to run into danger, and he who advises him to do so, that advice not being compulsory, differ not much in degree, and not at all in kind, of culpability. Whatever, therefore, explains Christ’s design in permitting Judas to become an Apostle, explains also his design in giving him a call to that office. But

¹ ‘We are totally at a loss to imagine to whom Professor Schleiermacher refers. Matthias and Barnabas (if he were the same as Joseph called Barsabas, which is not very probable) are the only two we can recall as probably among our Lord’s own disciples, and afterwards known to be engaged in promoting his cause. That they were superior to the others we have yet to learn.’

last of all, what says Professor Schleiermacher to the word ἐκλεξάμενος? He says that its sense must be determined by the context, and we have already shown what he makes of the context. On the other hand, we must beg to assert that there is no need whatever to recur to the context, for the sense of the word is not doubtful, nor its constant application to this very matter. First of all, let us observe that in Acts i. 2, we have the phrase, ἐντειλάμενος τοῖς ἀποστόλοις διὰ Πνεύματος ἁγίου οὗς ἐξελέξατο,—that at the choice of a new Apostle (Acts i. 24) this word is again used (Ἀνάδειξον ὃν ἐξελέξω) in a way which bears directly on our argument;—and then that it is applied (Acts vi. 5) to the choice of deacons¹. Next we must quote some strong expressions of St. John, which to us at least seem to put the matter beyond all dispute. In ch. vi. 70, we have the following, “Have I not chosen (ἐξελεξάμην) you the Twelve, and one of you is a devil?” And again in ch. xv. 16, (directly in the teeth of Professor Schleiermacher,) “Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen (ἐξελεξάμην) you.” The passage in ch. xiii. 18, respecting Judas, is also most remarkable. “I know whom I have chosen (ἐξελεξάμην), but, that the Scripture might be fulfilled, he that eateth,” &c.’

No. III.

Permanency of the Episcopal order.

THE statement that many Apostolic practices were temporary is a ready and a complete reply to those who argue the question,

¹ ‘There is a curious awkwardness of syntax in that place, recalling to mind what Professor Schleiermacher said as to the passage we have been treating of; Καὶ ἐξελέξαντο Στέφανον, (and six others then enumerated,) οὗς ἔστησαν ἐν ὧν τῶν ἀποστόλων. Here, as well as in the place of St. Luke, καὶ would be preferable to οὗς.’

simply on the ground that Episcopacy is an Apostolic institution, and has been always resorted to. For example, we have it at great length in Mosheim's *Institutiones Majores*, sæc. I. p. xi. ch. xi. ed. 8, note. It is remarkable that with his acuteness he should not have seen that there might be a distinction between these Apostolic institutions. Bishop Hobart has shown this as follows :

‘ But are all Apostolic practices equally important and obligatory? Certainly not. How then do we distinguish those Apostolic practices which were intended to last and be unchangeable from those which were temporary and mutable? We can determine instantly, from the nature of those practices, whether they were local and temporary, or of general and permanent observance. The love-feasts, the kiss of charity, the deaconesses who were to attend on women in baptism, were Apostolic practices evidently of superior moment, proper and necessary only under peculiar circumstances of the Church, and laid aside when those circumstances changed. But the practice of the Apostles in settling the Christian Ministry is of the first importance, and of permanent obligation. The Christian Ministry lies at the foundation of the Christian Church. The Apostles were to institute a ministry which was to continue by succession “to the end of the world;” we have the same right to change the sacraments, and to pretend that they are temporary and mutable, as we have to change the constitution of the Christian Ministry as settled by Apostolic practice. Here the institutions of the Apostles must be gathered from their practice, from their authoritative acts. The Ministry is of divine authority, and rests solely on a divine commission; (“No man taketh this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron.” Heb. v. 4;) this commission must be derived from Christ, the source of all power in the Church, by a succession of persons authorized to transmit it. In no other way can it be derived. Admit that

this succession has been interrupted—admit that the mode of transmitting the ministerial commission may be changed, may be placed in other hands than those in whom the Apostles placed it, and you render null the promise of Christ. “Lo! I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.” You suffer the gates of hell to prevail against the Church, for you wrest from it its divine character; you make its ministers and its sacraments human officers and human ordinances.

‘The connexion between the visible Church and the “Lord of all” can only be kept up by a visible Ministry, administering visible sacraments; and this Ministry can derive its authority from Christ only, in that mode and order originally constituted.

‘—— Episcopacy is unchangeable, because it is the originally constituted mode of conveying that commission, without which there can be no visible Ministry, no visible sacraments, no visible Church. The power of ordination must remain with the first grade of the Ministry, now called Bishops, because with them it was placed by the Apostles, divinely commissioned to found the Church, to constitute its Ministry, and to provide for the continuance of this Ministry to the “end of the world.” Change the Ministry, place the power of ordination in other hands, the Church is no longer founded “on the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;” its constitution and ministry have no power but what man gives them; it rests on the sandy foundation of human authority.’ Bishop Hobart’s *Apology for Apostolic Order*, p. 163.

The preceding passage from Bishop Hobart contains all that is requisite on this subject. The work from which it is taken is a series of controversial letters addressed to a Presbyterian divine in America. The latter part of this work contains by far the best statement of the arguments for Episcopacy which I know. The treatises of Hall and Taylor, full of learning, zeal,

and eloquence, as they undoubtedly are, overstate some points, and dwell on minutiae of little value to the argument. Bishop Hobart, on the contrary, gets rid of every thing not essential to the question, and shows what pure and real Episcopacy is, free from arbitrary adjuncts and human inventions. If his time would allow him to reprint the latter part of his work, with the omission of the few sentences relating to the local controversy in which he was engaged, he would do a great service to young divines; and the addition of his excellent Charges would compose a Tract of no ordinary value¹. I am tempted, by the strange ignorance which I have found prevailing on this subject, to state, in a very few lines, what are the opinions and views of Episcopalians. They readily allow that the names of Ἐπίσκοπος and Πρεσβύτερος are interchanged in the New Testament; but they maintain that there is a clear distinction of office to be found there; *i. e.* that it can be proved from Scripture that there was a Church officer who had the privilege of ordaining, which was never possessed by Presbyters at large. To those who recognise the necessity of a commission from reason, or acknowledge it from Scripture, they show clearly the necessity of such an officer, from the impossibility of continuing the commission without him. They

¹ Since the first edition of this work appeared, this invaluable man is gone to his rest. No words, which would not at least appear extravagant to those who did not know him, could convey my sense of his value, or of the loss which the Church of Christ has experienced in his removal; to those who did know him no words are necessary on either subject. I esteem it a matter of especial thankfulness that I had an opportunity of enjoying the happiness and advantage of free and familiar intercourse with such a man. The English friends who had shared that happiness with me, could have little hope, any more than myself, of ever seeing him again in this world. Yet they would all, I believe, concur with me in saying, that so strong a hold had he gained on our affections, that we felt as if we had lost a very *near* as well as a very *dear* friend. They would all, I am sure, concur with me when I say, that 'I shall bear his memory with me to the grave.'

then establish the existence of such an officer from history, beginning from the time of the Apostles down to the Reformation, and show that early records relate the planting of many Bishops even by the Apostles, and that the voice of history is loud in declaring the universality of the practice. Of course these statements cannot be proved here ; but if the young divine will search the treatises of Hall, of Hammond, and of Taylor, he will find full proof of them : and he need not trouble himself about the other positions of those great writers.

The only answer to this view which has ever been attempted, with even a show of argument, has been that founded on Jerome's statement as to the change introduced from Presbyterian to Episcopal government. I have already noticed that Jerome's meaning was probably only that this change was made by the Apostles themselves. Jeremy Taylor (*Episcopacy Asserted*) even assumes this to be the right meaning of the passage in Jerome. And it must be here added, that there is no record of any such change at any period of Church history whatever. Jerome lived at the end of the fourth century, so that he would be bad evidence of any very early change ; and the unreasonableness of supposing a change immediately after the Apostles' times is strongly and justly insisted on by many writers. (Forty years is the time fixed by Blondel and others. See Hoadley's *Brief Defence*, p. 65.) 'Can it,' says Bishop Hall, Part i. § 5, 'enter into any wise and honest head, that these prime saints, even in the greatest purity of the Church, would wilfully vary from the holy institutions of the blessed Apostles ; and as the fickle Israelites did, so soon after Moses' back was turned, worship idols of their own invention ? Surely he must be strongly uncharitable that shall think so ; strangely impudent that dares maintain it, and wickedly credulous that can believe it.'—So Barrow, (Vol. iii. Sermon xxiv. p. 273, ed. 1686,) 'The primitive general use of Christians most effectually doth back the

Scripture, and interpret it in favour of this distinction; scarce less than demonstrating it constituted by the *Apostles*; for how otherwise is it imaginable, that all the *Churches*, founded by the *Apostles*, in several most distant and disjoined places, (at *Jerusalem*, at *Antioch*, at *Alexandria*, at *Ephesus*, at *Corinth*, at *Rome*,) should presently conspire in acknowledgment and use of it? how could it otherwise, without apparent confederacy, be formed? how could it creep in without notable clatter? how could it be admitted without considerable opposition, if it were not in the foundation of those Churches laid by the *Apostles*? How is it likely, that in those times of grievous persecution, falling chiefly upon the *Bishops*, (when to be eminent among Christians yielded slender reward, and exposed to extreme hazard; when to seeke pre-eminence was in effect to court danger and trouble, torture and ruine,) an ambition of irregularly advancing themselves above their brethren should so generally prevail among the ablest and best Christians? How could those famous martyrs for the Christian truth be some of them so unconscionable as to affect, others so irresolute as to yield, to such injurious encroachments? and how could all the Holy Fathers (persons of so renowned, so approved wisdom and integrity) be so blind as not to discern such a corruption, or so bad as to abet it? How, indeed, could all God's Church be so weak as to consent in judgment, so base as to comply in practice with it? In fine, how can we conceive, that all the best monuments of antiquity down from the beginning, (the Acts, the Epistles, the Histories, the Commentaries, the Writings of all sorts coming from the blessed martyrs, and most holy confessors of our faith,) should conspire to abuse us? the which do speak nothing but bishops; long catalogues and rows of bishops succeeding in this and that city; bishops contesting for the faith against Pagan idolaters, and Heretical corrupters of Christian doctrine; bishops here teaching, and planting our religion by their labours, there suffering and watering it with their blood.'

Jeremy Taylor argues this point with his usual eloquence, in his 23rd section of *Episcopacy Asserted*. ‘For, consider we, is it imaginable that all the world should, immediately after the death of the Apostles, conspire together to seek themselves and not “*ea quæ sunt Jesu Christi*,” to erect a government of their own devising, not ordained by Christ, not delivered by his Apostles, and to relinquish a divine foundation and the apostolical superstructure, which, if it was at all, was a part of our Master’s will, “which whosoever knew and observed not, was to be beaten with many stripes?” Is it imaginable that those gallant men who could not be brought off from the prescription of Gentilism to the seeming impossibilities of Christianity, without evidence of miracle and clarity of demonstration on agreed principles, should all, upon their first adhesion to Christianity, make an universal dereliction of so considerable a part of their Maker’s will, and leave Gentilism to destroy Christianity? For he that erects another economy than what the Master of the family hath ordained, destroys all those relations of mutual dependence which Christ had made for the coadunation of all the parts of it, and so destroys in it the formality of a Christian congregation or family.’

The same point is examined at great length by Hoadley, in his *Brief Defence*, &c. Ch. i. p. 65, and following: one passage is worth extracting, (p. 69.) ‘Let any one but consider the regards of the first Christians towards things of the smallest importance which they imagined to be of apostolical institution; that they proceeded so far as to excommunicate one another for the sake of a supposed neglect in so insignificant a matter as the time of observing Easter; nay, that they were ready to die rather than voluntarily and designedly depart from any thing apostolical; and then judge whether any considerations could induce either Presbyters or people to carry forward and acquiesce in such a material alteration, or ever to believe that the form of

government in which the Apostles left the Churches was not as good, and as capable of preventing all things evil amongst Christians, as any other that could possibly be thought of in after ages. I grant that many matters of small importance which might plead apostolical custom or prescription might be dropped and diffused by degrees in after ages; but that the almost immediate successors of the Apostles should professedly meet to alter what they knew to be the Apostles' institution in such a matter as the government of the Church is incredible.'

The reasoning is indeed all on our side here; besides which the *onus probandi* lies on the adversary, who has not one single fact to allege. This point is urged also by Chillingworth in his remarks on Episcopacy at the end of his great work¹; and by Daubeney in the *Guide to the Church*, p. 25, (third edition,) and his Appendix, p. 29.

But if the change did not take place in or near the time of the Apostles, no one will venture, in the face of all history, to say that it took place later. And this seems conclusive as to the fate of the question. If any one wishes to see the miserable arguments resorted to by the opposite party, I would recommend him to look at Turretinus, T. iii. loc. xviii. § 21.

I may refer, for the same positions as those maintained by Bishop Hobart, to the Postscript to Law's Second Letter to Bishop Hoadley. They are there admirably urged in a passage beginning 'The great objection to this doctrine is,' p. 73, fourth edit. 1737. But I do not extract it, as these three letters are indispensable to every Episcopal student in divinity. As specimens of controversial style they are almost unrivalled; cool, clear, and keen to a degree quite astonishing; and written in that pure mother English which is the peculiar boast of this great writer in his earlier works. But it is not as specimens of

¹ See Appendix, No. IV.

controversy, but as master-pieces of argument that they are here recommended to the student. See too Bishop Hall's Works, Vol. ix. p. 599—601.

No. IV.

*Chillingworth on Episcopacy*¹.

‘IF we abstract from episcopal government all accidentals, and consider only what is essential and necessary to it, we shall find in it no more but this; an appointment of one man of eminent sanctity and sufficiency to have the care of all the churches, within a certain precinct or diocese, and furnishing him with authority, (not absolute or arbitrary, but regulated and bounded by laws, and moderated by joining to him a convenient number of assistants;) to the intent, that all the churches under him may be provided of good and able pastors: and that both of pastors and people, conformity to laws, and performance of their duties, may be required, under penalties not left to discretion, but by law appointed.

‘To this kind of government, I am not, by any particular interest, so devoted, as to think it ought to be maintained, either in opposition to apostolic institution, or to the much-desired reformation of men's lives, and restoration of primitive discipline, or to any law or precept of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; for that were to maintain a means contrary to the end; for obedience to our Saviour is the end for which Church government is appointed. But if it may be demonstrated, (or made much more probable than the contrary,) as I verily think it may:

1. That it is not repugnant to the government settled in and for the church by the Apostles:
2. That it is as compliable with the reformation of an evil, which we desire to reform, either in

¹ Chillingworth's Works, Vol. ii. p. 531, 8vo ed. 1820.

Church or State, or the introduction of any good, which we desire to introduce, as any kind of government: and, 3. That there is no law, no record of our Saviour against it: then, I hope, it will not be thought an unreasonable motion, if we humbly desire those that are in authority, especially the high court of parliament, that it may not be sacrificed to clamour, or overborne by violence: and though (which God forbid) the greater part of the multitude should cry, Crucify, crucify, yet our governors would be so full of justice and courage, as not to give it up, until they perfectly understand concerning episcopacy itself, *quid mali fecit*.

‘I shall speak at this time only of the first of these three points; that episcopacy is not repugnant to the government settled in the Church for perpetuity by the Apostles. Whereof I conceive this which follows is as clear a demonstration as any thing of this nature is capable of:

‘That this government was received universally in the Church either in the Apostles’ time, or presently after, is so evident and unquestionable, that the most learned adversaries of this government do themselves confess it.

‘Petrus Molinaeus, in his book, “*De Munere Pastoralis*,” purposely written in defence of the presbyterial government, acknowledgeth, that presently after the Apostles’ times, or even in their time, (as ecclesiastical story witnesseth,) it was ordained, that in every city one of the presbytery should be called a bishop, who should have pre-eminence over his colleagues, to avoid confusion, which oftentimes ariseth out of equality. And truly this form of government all churches every where received.

‘Theodorus Beza, in his tract, “*De triplici Episcopatus genere*,” confesseth in effect the same thing. For, having distinguished episcopacy into three kinds, Divine, human, and Satanical, and attributing to the second (which he calls human, but we maintain and conceive to be apostolical) not only a priority of order

but a superiority of power and authority over other presbyters, bounded yet by laws and canons provided against tyranny; he clearly professeth, that of this kind of episcopacy is to be understood whatsoever we read concerning the authority of bishops (or presidents, as Justin Martyr calls them) in Ignatius, and other more ancient writers.

‘Certainly, from¹ these two great defenders of the presbytery, we should never have had this free acknowledgment, (so prejudicial to their own pretence, and so advantageous to their adversaries’ purpose,) had not the evidence of clear and undeniable truth enforced them to it. It will not therefore be necessary to spend any time in confuting that uningenuous assertion of the anonymous author of the catalogue of testimonies for the equality of bishops and presbyters, who affirms, That their disparity began long after the Apostles’ times: but we may safely take for granted, that which these two learned adversaries have confessed, and see, whether upon this foundation laid by them, we may not by unanswerable reason raise this superstructure:

‘That seeing episcopal government is confessedly so ancient, and so catholic, it cannot with reason be denied to be apostolic.

‘For so great a change, as between presbyterial government and episcopal, could not possibly have prevailed all the world over in a little time. Had episcopal government been an aberration from (or a corruption of) the government left in the churches by the Apostles, it had been very strange, that it should have been received in any one church so suddenly, or that it should have

¹ To whom two others also from Geneva may be added: Daniel Chamierus (in *Panstratia*, tom. ii. lib. x. cap. vi. sect. 24.) and Nicol Videllius, (*Exercitat.* 3. in *Epist. Ignatii ad Philadelph.* cap. 14. et *Exercit.* 8. in *Epist. ad Mariam*, cap. iii.) which is also fully demonstrated in Dr. Hammond’s *Dissertations against Blondel*, (which never were answered, and never will,) by the testimonies of those who wrote in the very next ages after the Apostles.

prevailed in all for many ages after. *Variasse debuerat error ecclesiarum: quod autem apud omnes unum est, non est erratum, sed traditum.* “Had the churches erred, they would have varied; what therefore is one and the same amongst all, came not surely by error, but tradition.” Thus Tertullian argues very probably, from the consent of the Churches of his time, not long after the Apostles, and that in matter of opinion, much more subject to unobserved alteration. But that in the frame and substance of the necessary government of the Church, a thing always in use and practice, there should be so sudden a change, as presently after the Apostles’ times; and so universal, as received in all the Churches: this is clearly impossible.

‘For, what universal cause can be assigned or feigned of this universal apostasy? You will not imagine, that the Apostles, all or any of them, made any decree for this change when they were living; or left order for it in any will or testament when they were dying. This were to grant the question: to wit—That the Apostles, being to leave the government of the Churches themselves, and either seeing by experience, or foreseeing by the Spirit of God, the distractions and disorders which would arise from a multitude of equals, substituted episcopal government instead of their own. General councils, to make a law for a general change, for many ages there was none. There was no Christian emperor, no coercive power, over the Church to enforce it. Or, if there had been any, we know no force was equal to the courage of the Christians of those times. Their lives were then at command (for they had not then learnt to fight for Christ), but their obedience to any thing against his law was not to be commanded, (for they had perfectly learnt to die for him). Therefore, there was no power then to command this change; or, if there had been any, it had been in vain.

‘What device then shall we study, or to what fountain shall we reduce this strange pretended alteration? Can it enter into

our hearts to think, that all the presbyters and other Christians then, being the Apostles' scholars, could be generally ignorant of the will of Christ, touching the necessity of a presbyterial government? Or, dare we adventure to think them so strangely wicked all the world over, as against knowledge and conscience to conspire against it? Imagine the spirit of Diotrophes had entered into some, or a great many of the presbyters, and possessed them with an ambitious desire of a forbidden superiority, was it possible they should attempt and achieve it at once without any opposition or contradiction? And, besides, that the contagion of this ambition should spread itself, and prevail without stop or control; nay, without any noise or notice taken of it, through all the Churches in the world; all the watchmen in the mean time being so fast asleep, and all the dogs so dumb, that not so much as one should open his mouth against it?

'But let us suppose (though it be a horrible untruth) that the presbyters and people then were not so good Christians as the presbyterians are now; that they were generally so negligent to retain the government of Christ's Church commanded by Christ, which we are now so zealous to restore; yet certainly we must not forget nor deny, that they were men as we are. And if we look upon them as mere natural men, yet, knowing by experience, how hard a thing it is, even for policy armed with power, by many attempts and contrivances, and in a long time, to gain upon the liberty of any one people; undoubtedly we shall never entertain so wild an imagination, as that, among all the Christian presbyters in the world, neither conscience of duty, nor love of liberty, nor averseness from pride, and usurpation of others over them, should prevail so much with any one, as to oppose this pretended universal invasion of the kingdom of Jesus Christ, and the liberty of Christians.

'When I shall see therefore all the fables in the metamorphosis acted, and prove true stories; when I shall see all the

democracies and aristocracies in the world lie down and sleep, and awake into monarchies; then will I begin to believe, that presbyterial government, having continued in the church during the Apostles' times, should presently after (against the Apostles' doctrine, and the will of Christ) be whirled about like a scene in a mask, and transformed into episcopacy. In the mean time, while these things remain thus incredible, and in human reason impossible, I hope I shall have leave to conclude thus :

'Episcopal government is acknowledged to have been universally received in the Church, presently after the Apostles' times.

'Between the Apostles' times and this presently after, there was not time enough for, nor possibility of, so great an alteration.

'And therefore, there was no such alteration as is pretended. And therefore episcopacy, being confessed to be so ancient and catholic, must be granted also to be apostolic : Quod erat demonstrandum.'

No. V.

*Reflections on Church Government by Mr. Hey, of Leeds*¹.

'1. IT appears, from various declarations of our Saviour and his Apostles, that the Christian Church shall never cease to exist in the world; we may, therefore, fairly conclude, that the directions which are given in Holy Writ for the formation of the Church in the time of the Apostles, are to be applied to the same society in all ages; allowance being made for the cessation of those miraculous powers which were granted to the first Christians, and for the unavoidable disturbance to which the

¹ Hey's Tracts, p. 575.

regular order of the Church may be exposed in times of persecution. What the inspired Apostles considered as important in the formation of the Church, ought not to be considered by us as of little import. The Church must be formed after some model; and we have no authority to deviate from that model which inspiration dictated, unless it be in such things as are, by a change of circumstances, rendered impracticable. It is not a sufficient objection to say,—The Apostles did not declare, that this order was to be perpetual. Such a declaration was unnecessary. A regulation appointed by Divine authority, in a society that was destined to continue to the end of time, bears the stamp of perpetuity upon the face of it. It should become impracticable, before it should cease to be practised by those who take the Word of God for their guide. All laws which are not expressly made for a limited time, are of course perpetual, until they are abrogated by an authority equal to that by which they were enacted. Christians of all persuasions seem to agree in these sentiments; for they either profess to form their Church government on what they conceive to be the primitive model, or attempt to support, by the authority of Scripture, that order which they have adopted from accidental circumstances.

‘2. The commands relative to Church government, like those which relate to many other duties, are partly positive, and partly discretionary.

‘In this case we are as much bound by the positive declarations, as if nothing had been left to our discretion. General directions are also given for the regulation of those circumstances which are committed to our discretion. We stand in the same predicament with relation to other duties. Alms-deeds, for instance, are positively enjoined, but no specific proportion of our wealth is directed to be set apart for this purpose. Yet we have general directions to guide our conduct in this discretionary circumstance. It is our duty to collect those particulars

which the Apostles clearly enjoined, by precept or example, in the formation of the Christian Church, as far as they are applicable to a settled state of the Church. Such injunctions we are bound to follow. No private opinions of what is best can authorize us to depart from them. In all matters left to our discretion, we must conduct ourselves by those general rules which the Scriptures afford for the guidance of that discretion. If it should appear, for instance, that the Apostles appointed different orders of ministers in the Church, but did not appoint a particular mode of conducting public worship; the Christian Church is bound to retain those orders of ministers, but may exercise its discretion with respect to the mode of worship, provided the general rules given for the guidance of that discretion are observed. Or, if the Apostles have marked out with precision the duties of an officer of great consequence in the Christian Church, whose continuance in the Church was necessary for the execution of that plan of Church government which they, by Divine inspiration, had appointed; and yet have left no directions how this officer should be elected in future ages; we are bound to consider the office as perpetual, but the mode of election to that office as discretionary.

‘3. Some persons have imagined, that if matters relative to Church government had been of importance, they would have been more clearly revealed. Such imaginations are highly improper, if Divine revelation has given any directions relative to this subject. We must not pretend to dictate to the all-wise God, how he shall reveal his will to us. If he has revealed it in any way, this ought to be considered as sufficient to command our obedience.

‘That excellent writer, Bishop Butler, has observed, that a preponderance of argument in favour of any duty requires our obedience, as well as a more clear and explicit revelation. Let it be granted, for the sake of argument, that no particular form

of Church government is *commanded* in Scripture ; yet, we cannot thence conclude, that all Christian Churches have equally the support of Divine authority. For the inspired Apostles formed the first Christian Church after a particular model ; and if any modern Church has the example of the Apostles on its side, all other things being by the supposition equal, this Church has a preponderance of argument in its favour.

‘ 4. But the example of persons acting by Divine authority, not only affords a preponderance of argument in favour of any branch of conduct, in which they may be imitated ; but it is expressly proposed in Holy Scripture, as a model of our conduct. The Apostle Paul says, “ Walk so as ye have us for an example ;” and no good reason can be given why his example should be followed only in things pertaining to private life. His example, as a superintendent of the Christian Church, calls for imitation. We may, therefore, rank among the number of Divine precepts such rules as he prescribed for the formation and government of the Christian Church, as far as they relate to it in a settled state, in which no miraculous powers were to exist, nor special inspiration to direct its governors.

‘ 5. Though the Scriptures are our only sure guide with respect to Christian doctrines and practice ; yet, if it should appear, that the Scriptures are silent with respect to a matter of fact, well known to those whom the Apostles addressed in their epistles ; we seem to be directed in this particular to the first writers in the Christian Church, who have mentioned the fact concerning which we are inquiring. If, for instance, an officer of some consequence in the Christian Church is frequently mentioned in the New Testament, in the choice of whom great care was to be observed, and yet the sacred writings are silent with respect to the duties of his office ; we are evidently led to inquire of the first Christian writers, what these duties were, and to acknowledge them to be the proper duties of the office.

4E '6. It has been considered by many as a sufficient proof of the rectitude of the government subsisting in any Church, that the labours of its ministers have been beneficial to mankind. If these have turned sinners unto righteousness, they are regarded as possessing a sure testimony of the Divine approbation of their conduct. The conversion of sinners has perhaps never been effected by any who have opposed, or neglected, the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel; but success in this important concern will not prove that a minister is altogether right in his sentiments or conduct. The differences which subsist among pious and successful ministers of different persuasions must convince us, that errors to a certain degree are not inconsistent with success. Yet we should always keep in mind, that a wilful neglect of any divine command can admit no apology. We must not argue, that, because our obedience is strict in matters of great concern, we may allow ourselves to depart from the Gospel rule in matters of inferior moment. We should always keep in mind the declaration of our Saviour when comparing the tithing of mint, anise, and cummin, with the weightier matters of the law; "These ought ye to have done, and not to leave the others undone." We may not be aware of the injury which religion, in a course of time, may sustain, by a departure from that order in the Church, which Divine authority has established: nor are we allowed to weigh the consequences of disobedience, with the view to satisfy ourselves in the neglect of any Divine command.

"One general command respecting Church government is, "Let all things be done decently and in order;" and if success is to be considered universally as a proof of right conduct, then no one was ever instrumental in turning a sinner from the error of his way, who, in that part of his conduct which proved beneficial, was guilty of a breach of this command. I will not at present consider what decency and order require, but will, in

this argument, leave every one to his own judgment. I will only appeal to the conscience of every reader, whether he is persuaded that the spiritual good above-mentioned was never effected by any one, while departing from such conduct as decency and order required.

‘Again : the same conduct may do good in one respect, and mischief in another. If we are to regulate ourselves by events, and not by Divine commands, we must first know whether the conduct in question will do more good or harm. This rule is very uncertain, and must always be superseded by the authority of a Divine command. It can only be called in aid in matters of which the consequences are doubtful, and of such as are left entirely to our own discretion.

‘If even greater good should appear to be done, for a time, by following our own plans ; yet a conduct not regulated by Divine authority, may bring on a course of events attended with irreparable mischief, far out-weighing the present temporary advantage.

‘Further, when we allow ourselves to break through the order of Divine appointment, with the prospect of doing a greater good ; we depart from that subordinate station in which Divine Providence has placed us. We take upon ourselves to direct, where we ought to obey. We disregard that express Divine prohibition of doing evil that good may come ; and forget that sentence which the Apostle has pronounced upon all who conduct themselves by such a principle, “ Whose damnation is just.”

‘7. The charge of uncharitableness seems to deter many from entering upon the inquiry, whether any mode of Church government has exclusively the stamp of Divine authority. They see good men of all persuasions, and therefore think it needless to inquire, which form of Church government is most conformable to the plan laid down in Holy Scripture. They are also deterred from this investigation by the idea, that a claim to Divine autho-

city in an affair concerning which good people are so much divided, would imply an uncharitable censure upon all who differ from ourselves.

‘True Christian charity will never deter us from the most strict inquiry into our duty. We are not to guide ourselves by the conduct of others, who have no greater claim to inspiration than ourselves. The unerring word of God, the Bible, is our rule of faith and practice. “Let God be true, and every man a liar.” It is our duty to examine the word of God carefully, that we may regulate our conduct aright in every particular. We shall not be excused in any neglect or error, concerning which Divine authority would set us right, by pleading the example of others. Nor does it necessarily follow, that we must condemn others, who profess to follow the same guide as ourselves, because we may differ in our interpretation of some things contained in Divine revelation.

‘On the orders of Ministers in the Christian Church, and the manner of their appointment.

‘When our blessed Redeemer took leave of “the eleven disciples,” he commanded them to teach all nations, and promised to be with them “alway, even to the end of the world¹ :” but he gave no instructions respecting the different orders of Ministers in his Church, nor the manner of their appointment. This promise, however, implied that there should be a succession of Ministers in the Christian Church to the end of the world. And as our Saviour also promised to instruct his Apostles by his Holy Spirit, and to guide them into all truth ; we must look into the Acts of the Apostles, and their Epistles, to discover the will of our Lord on this subject.

¹ Matthew xxviii. 20.

‘The question to be investigated in these observations is this, —What instructions have the Apostles given either by example or precept, respecting the different orders of Ministers, in a settled state of the Church, after their departure? I say, in a *settled* state of the Church, after the departure of the Apostles : because its first state was so extraordinary, and so fraught with miraculous power, that a perfect imitation of it cannot be adopted. This original state of the Church is thus described by the Apostle Paul. “God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers ; after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues¹.” Apostles and prophets are gone : gifts of healing, and diversities of tongues have ceased. We must be content with teachers and governors. Let us inquire what the Scripture has said concerning these.

‘This list is a little varied in the Epistle to the Ephesians, where it is said, “He gave, some, apostles ; and some, prophets ; and some, evangelists ; and some, pastors and teachers².” What the word *evangelist* means, if it implied a distinct order, cannot be collected from Scripture. It is but mentioned in two other places, viz. Acts xxi. 28, “We entered into the house of Philip the evangelist.” And 2 Timothy iv. 5, “Watch thou in all things, endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry.” The word literally means a preacher of the gospel. The use of it in any other sense must be conjectural.

‘The titles appropriated to ordinary teachers in the Church of Christ, are bishops, presbyters or elders, and deacons. Perhaps

¹ 1 Corinthians xii. 28.

² Ephesians iv. 11.

Prophets are so clearly distinguished, in both these passages, from *pastors* and *teachers*, that we cannot, by any just reasoning, consider the conduct of the former as conveying a direction for that of the latter.

we shall discover another order to which the Scriptures have given no title, except in the Book of the Revelations. It may be proper to remark, for the sake of those readers who are not acquainted with the original language of the New Testament, that the terms of *presbyter* and *elder* are strictly synonymous; the former being only a Greek word with an English termination, and the latter, a translation of that Greek word into pure English. To avoid confusion, I shall only use the word *presbyter*, as having less ambiguity.

‘It seems that presbyters were the ordinary Ministers of the Church. Paul and Barnabas, in their first tour from Antioch, *ordained them presbyters in every Church*¹. Paul, being in haste to be at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, determined to sail by Ephesus, and called the “*presbyters of the Church*,”² giving them his parting advice, as to ordinary Ministers of the Church. Paul left Titus in Crete, to “*ordain presbyters in every city*”³. The business of ruling and teaching the flock belongs to them. “*Let the presbyters that rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who labour in the word and doctrine*”⁴.’

‘The terms, *bishop* and *presbyter*, are used in the New Testament for the same kind of Minister. There are five passages from which this appears to be the case. When St. Paul sent from Miletus for the presbyters of Ephesus, he commanded them “*to take heed to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost had made them overseers, (it is the same word in the original, which is elsewhere translated bishops,) to feed the Church of God, which He hath purchased with his own blood*”⁵.’ St. Paul says to Titus, “*For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain presbyters in every city, as I had appointed*

¹ Acts xiv. 23.² Acts xx. 17.³ Titus i. 5.⁴ 1 Tim. v. 17.⁵ Acts xx. 28.

thee. If any be blameless, the husband of one wife, having faithful children, not accused of riot or unruly; for a bishop must be blameless¹," &c. In these two passages, the terms are clearly synonymous.

'The same Apostle addresses his Epistle to the Philippians, "To all the saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons." Can we suppose, that there were many bishops and no presbyters at Philippi; or that St. Paul would omit mentioning these, while he addresses the deacons? These suppositions are so improbable, that I can entertain no doubt of the term *bishop* being here used for *presbyter*.

'Again: the Apostle, in his first Epistle to Timothy, chap. iii., gives particular directions respecting the character of those who were to be admitted to the offices of *bishop* and *deacon*, but does not, in that chapter, make mention of *presbyters*. The passage is natural and void of difficulty, if by the term *bishop*, we understand *presbyter*; in any other sense, the omission of the term *presbyter* is unaccountable; since Timothy was left at Ephesus, as Titus was in Crete, for this purpose (among others) of ordaining presbyters.

'Lastly; St. Peter, in his first Epistle, chapter v., says, "The presbyters who are among you I exhort, who am also a presbyter," (for though the Apostles were superintendents of other ministers, they still fulfilled the office of ordinary preachers of the Gospel): "feed the flock of God which is among you, *taking the oversight* thereof," (or, as it might be rendered, "executing the office of a bishop,") "not by constraint, but willingly²," &c. From these passages it is plain, that the terms *bishop* and *presbyter* were used as synonymous by the writers of the New Testament³.

¹ Titus i. 5—7.

² 1 Pet v. 1, 2.

³ 'No difficulty can arise from the application of the term *bishop* to ordinary presbyters if we take into consideration the original meaning of

‘ Before I proceed to inquire whether the Scriptures have given us any intimation of a church officer, superior in rank to that of a presbyter, let us hear what is said respecting deacons. No instructions are given to Titus respecting this office ; but in the first Epistle to Timothy, the same character for piety and good conduct is required in deacons as in presbyters. Nay, it is added, “ Let these also first be proved, then let them use the office of a deacon, being found blameless ;” chapter iii. 10. Yet this office seems to have been probationary with respect to a higher office, for it is said, “ They that use the office of a deacon well, purchase to themselves a *good degree*,” *ib.* 13. But wherein did the office of a deacon consist? The Scriptures have not informed us. Some readers may be surprised at this assertion, and ask, Were not seven deacons appointed to take care of the public stock in the Church¹? It is true, that “ seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom,” were chosen by the people, and appointed by the Apostles to take care that no partiality be shown in favour of the Hebrew women, in distributing the daily portion of food provided by the Church ; but these men are not called *deacons*, except in the running title of our Bibles. The text does not give them that name. Indeed, if it did, we should gain but little information as to the perpetual

the word, and the manner in which it is applied in the Scriptures. The word in the original signifies an overlooker or overseer, and is thus properly translated in the English Testament, Acts xx. 28. For the presbyters were the overseers of the flock of Christ, and it is with relation to the flock, and not to other ministers, that the presbyters are called bishops : as in the passage last quoted ; “ Take heed to the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers” or bishops. So also in 1 Peter, chapter v., “ Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof,” &c. Whereas, superintendents, as the Apostles, and by delegation from them, Timothy and Titus, were overseers or bishops of other pastors, as the Epistles to Timothy and Titus abundantly prove.’

¹ Acts vi.

office of a deacon; for the employment imposed upon them was local and temporary, and has long since ceased to exist. In no part of the New Testament, that I recollect, is the office of a deacon described.

‘ Though the office of a deacon is not described in the New Testament, it must have been perfectly understood, not only by Timothy, to whom minute directions were given for the choice of proper persons to fill that office; but also by the Christians of that period, among whom the duties of the office were daily exercised. The Christian Church of modern times ought, therefore, to search out the nature of the office in those ecclesiastical writings which approach the nearest to the times of the Apostles.

‘ Two properties of the office may be collected from the Scriptures. First, that it was an office, which, in point of importance, was similar to that of presbyter; for the same marks are laid down for the guidance of Timothy in the choice of deacons, as in the choice of presbyters. They were to be men of similar piety and good conduct in every relation of life. And, secondly, the office is described as probationary. It was designed to be a step to something higher. The rest must be supplied from the stores of ecclesiastical history.

‘ We proceed then to inquire, whether the Apostles did appoint any officer in the Church, of a degree superior to that of presbyter; such an officer as would now be called a bishop¹. That we may, with greater certainty, discover the truth in this investigation, let us first state what is the peculiar office of a bishop,

¹ ‘ The reader must not understand me as hinting, that this appropriate use of the word bishop is of modern date. By consulting ecclesiastical history he will find, that it was used in this appropriate sense by those who had been contemporary with the Apostle John, and that the Christian Church continued to use it in this sense after the death of the Apostles. But my observations are confined to the account which is given of the Christian Church in the New Testament.’

considered as superior to a presbyter; and then inquire, whether the Apostles appointed any such officer in the Church.

‘The peculiar office of a bishop consists in these four particulars.

‘1. In ordaining presbyters and deacons.

‘2. In superintending the doctrine of these ministers.

‘3. In superintending their conduct.

‘4. In regulating those matters in the Church, which are not settled by Divine authority.

‘Now these duties of a superintendent or bishop, were committed by the Apostle Paul to Timothy and Titus.

‘1. They were appointed to ordain other ministers, as the Apostles had done before them. “For this cause,” says the Apostle to Titus, “left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest ordain presbyters in every city, as I had appointed thee,” chapter i. 5. So, likewise, special directions were given to Timothy respecting the choice of those whom he should ordain presbyters or deacons¹. Of these directions I shall have occasion to speak hereafter.

‘2. They were appointed to superintend the doctrine of these ministers. So says the Apostle to Timothy; “I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine².”

‘3. They were appointed to superintend the conduct of other ministers. “Against a presbyter receive not an accusation, but before two or three witnesses³.” He who is authorized to receive accusations, and hear witnesses against any person, is authorized to be the judge of that person.

‘4. They were appointed to regulate such matters in the Church, as were not settled by express Divine command. “For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting;” that are left undone, as the margin

¹ 1 Tim. iii.

² 1 Tim. i. 3.

³ 1 Tim. v. 19.

expresses it¹. This was a branch of apostolic authority which is here delegated to Titus, as appears from 1 Corinthians ii. 34. For, when the Apostle Paul had rectified the erroneous manner of receiving the Lord's Supper, into which the Corinthians had fallen, by stating to them the nature of that ordinance according to its original institution, he adds, that he would regulate inferior matters when he should be present with them. "And the rest will I set in order when I come."

'Some other peculiarities of the office of superintendent might perhaps be collected from the New Testament; but these will suffice to show, that there was an office in the Church, superior to that of presbyter (but including it), though no name is given in the New Testament, except in the Revelations, to the persons who were to fill that office by delegation from the Apostles. The office itself, however, is described with great clearness; and two persons are mentioned to whom that office was delegated by the Apostle Paul.

'We will now consider what was the mode of appointing presbyters and deacons; and to whom was the choice of persons, to fill those offices, committed.

'The persons chosen were solemnly set apart by prayer and imposition of hands, in which (if we may form a judgment from one instance) the presbytery joined with the Apostle. In the first Epistle to Timothy, the Apostle Paul says, "Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery;" chapter iv. 14. In the second Epistle, speaking, as it seems, of the same transaction, the Apostle says, "I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the gift of God, which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands;" chapter i. 6. These passages are of equal authority, and therefore prove, that the presbytery joined with the

¹ Titus i. 5.

*See Colossians remark i.
This text quoted in London
Translation p. 23*

Apostle in the imposition of hands, when Timothy received the gift of God, whatever that gift implied. Supposing the expression to refer to the ordination of Timothy, and supposing the ordination to be a specimen of all other ordinations, it will then follow, that the presbytery joined with the Apostle, or some delegated superintendent, in the imposition of hands; but no mention is made in the New Testament of any ordination to the ministry by presbyters, without the presence of an Apostle or some superintendent delegated by an Apostle.

‘ But to whom was the choice committed of persons who were to fill the office of presbyter or deacon? To the persons who were delegated by the Apostles to execute the office of superintendent or bishop; for thus runs the apostolic injunction respecting ordination: “The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also ¹.”

‘ When the “daily ministration” of the food provided for the widows was conducted with partiality, the Apostles desired the people “to look out among themselves, seven men of honest report, whom they appointed to serve the tables.” Or when the charitable contribution of the Corinthians was to be carried to Jerusalem, St. Paul tells them, “that whomsoever they should appoint, them would he send to bring their liberality to Jerusalem ².” But I recollect no instance of the people choosing either presbyter or deacon. The seven men chosen to serve the widows, as I have already observed, are not called deacons in the Acts of the Apostles.

‘ After the traitor Judas had destroyed himself, the disciples, by the direction of Peter, appointed two persons out of the number of those who had accompanied our Lord through the whole of his ministry, that one might “be ordained to be a

¹ 2 Tim. ii. 2.

² 1 Corinthians xvi. 3.

witness," with the other Apostles, "of his resurrection." The choice of this person was submitted to the Almighty, by the intervention of the lot. "They prayed, and said, Thou, Lord, who knowest the hearts of all men, show whether of these two *thou hast chosen*." This was a singular case, and was not considered by the Apostles, or their delegates, as a precedent for future ordinations.

'Some persons have been of opinion, that the original word, used to express the ordination of presbyters by Paul and Barnabas¹, implies, that it was done with the suffrage, or voting, of the people. As this word has been thus paraphrased by an excellent writer on the New Testament², I shall subjoin a remark or two on this paraphrase. The word in this passage, translated *ordained*, does undoubtedly imply a choice or election, and did, in its primary sense, I believe, express the election by lifting up of hands. But every person conversant in the original language of the New Testament must know, that it often signifies choice or election, simply, without voting³. Now since this is the case, as is allowed by the author to whom I allude, it is impossible to prove that the votes of the people had anything to do with these ordinations, merely from the use of that Greek word, unless the context had given some intimation, that the votes of the people directed the choice of the Apostles. But no such hint is given in the context. The most fair method of discovering the meaning of an author in any doubtful word, is to examine how he uses that word in other parts of his writings. Now the word here supposed to imply the votes of the people, is used but once besides, I think, by St. Luke; and there it could not imply any voting, or other interference of the people, for it is used to

¹ 'Χειροτονήσαντες δὲ αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους. Acts xiv. 23.'

² 'Dr. Doddridge. "Family Expositor," vol. iii. p. 228.'

³ 'The reader may see many instances of this collected by Dr Hammond, in his note on the text in question.'

express the choice of God himself. "God showed him openly; not to all the people, but unto witnesses *chosen before* of God ¹." St. Paul does not use this Greek word when he commands Titus to ordain presbyters, chapter i. 5, but another word ², which has no relation to the suffrage, or other interference of the people; and which is properly translated ordain (*i. e.* constitute or appoint) presbyters.

'There is abundant proof, that the election of the presbyters and deacons was to be made by the superintendents who were appointed to ordain them. For what end does the Apostle Paul give Timothy and Titus such minute directions respecting the character of persons to be ordained by them, if these directions were not to guide their choice? After all these directions, Timothy is commanded to use great caution in his choice; in Scriptural language, to "lay hands suddenly on no man." If the choice was not committed to him, and his business was only to lay hands upon those whom the votes of the people presented to him, it was no matter how suddenly he laid his hands upon them. Though these considerations seem quite sufficient to produce conviction, yet the evidence is not exhausted; for the Apostle expressly says, that the directions which he gave to Timothy concerning the character of the persons to be ordained, were designed to guide his conduct. "These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto thee shortly; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know how thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, which is the Church of the living God ³."

'As the persons who filled the office of superintendent or bishop, were chosen by the Apostles themselves; and as no delegation of their power to choose successors in this office, is

¹ 'Προκεχειροτονημένοις ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Acts x. 41.'

² 'Καταστήσῃς κατὰ πόλιν πρεσβυτέρους.'

³ 1 Timothy iii. 14, 15.

mentioned in the New Testament; the Church of Christ is necessarily left to its own discretion with respect to the manner of continuing this office in the Church. The superintendent was clearly the next in station to the Apostle, as far as related to the ordinary and permanent state of the Church. And, with respect to the ordination of presbyters and deacons, and the regulation of inferior matters in the Church, he was manifestly endowed with Apostolic power. The Christian Church will, therefore, make the nearest approach to the primitive model, by continuing a succession of superintendents through the intervention of their predecessors of the same order. At any rate, a succession of these officers must be continued, if the primitive model of Church government is to be pursued; for there is no instance in the New Testament of any ordination of presbyter or deacon, either by the people, or by the presbytery alone.

‘The importance of the episcopal office will more clearly appear, if we sum up and reduce into one view, those passages in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, which exhibit its peculiar duties; at least, those which relate to the four branches of the office which I have already mentioned.

‘Let us then suppose the Apostle Paul to have given the following commission to one who was already a presbyter¹.

“My dear Son,—As my affairs have called me out of Asia into Greece, and I have ‘besought thee to abide at Ephesus when I went into Macedonia;’ I think it proper to give thee in writing such instructions as are necessary for the guidance of thy conduct. There are many presbyters at Ephesus, and these require some one to superintend them, as they superintend ‘the

¹ ‘To prevent interruption by quoting the chapter and verse of each text as it occurs, I shall only give the text between inverted commas. The reader may easily find the passages, as they are all contained in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus, unless where it is otherwise noted.’

flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers¹. I have observed with sorrow, that there are some of them in danger of 'giving heed to fables;' nay, who have already 'turned aside unto vain jangling; desiring to be teachers of the law; understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.' Now, I beseech thee, look well to the doctrine of these ministers. If it be possible, prevent error from spreading in the Church. Remember, that for this purpose I left thee at Ephesus, 'that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine' than that which they have received from me. 'Of these things put them in remembrance, charging them before the Lord, that they strive not about words to no profit, but to the subverting of the hearers.' Be diligent both in government and instruction; and what thou hast learned from me, 'these things command and teach.' Exert the authority with which I have invested thee, and put to silence improper teachers. 'For there are many unruly and vain talkers, whose mouths must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not.' And as heresy is destructive to the purity of the Church, suffer not a person tainted with this contagious disease to remain in the communion of the faithful, when repeated advice and counsel have failed to reclaim him. 'A man that is an heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.'

“ I also command thee, that thou look well to the conduct of the ministers over whom I have placed thee. But execute this delicate business with discretion. The character of ministers is of great consequence. And, although I have appointed thee to be the judge of their conduct, yet be not hasty to condemn any one without a fair hearing. 'Against a presbyter do not even receive an accusation, but before two or three witnesses.'

“ See that the ordinances appointed by Christ are observed in

¹ Acts xx. 28.

the Church according to his appointment. Yet there are many inferior matters which thou must regulate as decency and 'good order shall require'. 'For this cause left I thee' at Ephesus, 'that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and that have hitherto been left undone.'

' "Use the utmost caution in the choice of persons who are to execute the office of ministers. I do not consider all as forward, who seek to be overseers of the flock of Christ; for, 'if a man desire the office of a bishop, he desireth a good work.' But accept no candidate for this office, unless he 'be blameless, vigilant, sober, of good behaviour,' and 'have a good report of them that are without' the Christian Church, 'lest he fall into reproach.' Do not ordain 'a novice, lest, being lifted up with pride, he fall into the condemnation of the devil.' Be not hasty in forming thy judgment of men's characters, however fair they may appear; 'lay hands suddenly on no man. Stir up the gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my hands, with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery.' And in the solemn act of ordination, let the presbytery join with thee in the imposition of hands, seeing thou canst not follow a better example than that which was shown at thine own ordination².

' "Finally, my son, 'be strong in the grace that is in Christ Jesus. And the things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also.' "

'These passages of Scripture, (which, I hope, have not been in any degree perverted by my paraphrase,) with others of the same import, have satisfied my mind, that in the primitive Church there were superintendents, answering to the officers now called

¹ 1 Corinthians xiv. 40.

² 'This is the method enjoined by the Church of England in her ordination service for presbyters.'

bishops. By what name these should be distinguished in after-ages, is of no consequence. Whether they should be itinerant, or stationary; whether they should exercise their functions over a small or a large district; whether they should stand totally unconnected with the government under which they might live, or be called to give their advice in matters of public concern; would depend on a variety of circumstances, which we are not at all concerned to inquire after, and enumerate.

‘Observations on the government of the Christian Church, during the last period of the Sacred History contained in the New Testament.

‘If we are desirous of knowing what kind of government was established by Divine authority in the primitive Church of Christ, we must not look for it in those passages of Scripture which represent the Apostles and other Ministers as engaged in the exercise of the miraculous powers with which they were endowed; nor in those passages which describe the disturbed state of the Church, through the violence of persecution. We must look for it in those appointments which have an evident respect to futurity; and fix our regard on those passages of Scripture which describe the Church in its most settled and ordinary state.

‘My inquiries have hitherto been confined to the formation of the Christian Church during the life of the Apostle Paul. But the sacred history carries us somewhat further, and exhibits the government of the Church at a later period. The Epistles which St. John was commanded to write to the seven Churches in Asia will throw further light on this subject.

‘St. John is supposed to have outlived the rest of the Apostles¹, and the Churches to which he wrote seem to have been

¹ “Domitian banished him into the solitary Isle of Patmos, where he was favoured with the visions of the Apocalypse. After Domitian’s death, he

for some time in a settled state. We have, therefore, a good opportunity of learning from these Epistles, what was the true apostolic form of Church government.

‘Our information will chiefly arise from considering what kind of minister was designed by the term, “angels of the Churches.” I take for granted, that the term implies a minister of some description. The strain of the Epistles, and the distinction made between the angel and the people of which the Church consisted, point out this so clearly, that no doubt can arise in the mind of any one who is content to take the Scriptures in their most obvious meaning.

‘It seems also sufficiently plain, that the angel was an individual person. He is always addressed as such by the inspired writer. And as it is expressly said, that there were seven angels, and one in each Church, there can be no ground for contest on this subject. I shall not dwell, therefore, on the absurdity of a contrary supposition, though that is manifest from the minute description which is given of each of the angels.

‘By the term angel must then be meant, either the sole presbyter presiding over the congregation of Christians at Ephesus, Smyrna, &c. respectively ; or a superintendent in each Church, presiding over the presbyters as well as over the flock.

‘In order that we may form our ideas on this subject in exact conformity to the Scripture history, let us consider the state of the first of these Churches addressed by the Apostle John, concerning which we have the most ample information, and apply our conclusions to the rest of the Churches ; in doing which, we shall find ourselves supported by the instructions addressed to the angels of the other Churches.

‘The labours of St. Paul had been abundant in the Lesser returned from Patmos, and governed the Asiatic Churches. There he remained till the time of Trajan.”—Milner’s Ecclesiastical History, vol. i. p. 138, edit. 2.’

Asia. He had at one time preached in the Jewish synagogue at Ephesus "for the space of three months;" and, "when divers were hardened, and believed not, but spake evil of that way before the multitude, he departed from them, and separated the disciples, disputing daily in the school of one Tyrannus. And this continued by the space of two years; so that all they which dwelt in Asia heard the word of the Lord Jesus, both Jews and Greeks. So that not alone at Ephesus, but almost throughout all Asia, this Paul" (in the language of Demetrius) had "persuaded and turned away much people ¹."

'It is probable, therefore, that by the "Church of Ephesus" was meant, not only the Christians in that city, but those also in the adjacent country; a great number of whom must have been converted to the truth during this long residence of the Apostle. If this was the meaning of the term used by St. John, the "angel of the Church of Ephesus," must have been a minister presiding over a considerable district. But omitting this reasonable supposition, it is clear, that the number of Christians residing in the city of Ephesus was so great, as to require the care of several presbyters. For, when St. Paul passed by this city in his way from Greece to Jerusalem, he summoned these presbyters to meet him at Miletus. "From Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the presbyters of the Church ²."

'It is certain, therefore, by the term "angel of the Church of Ephesus," could not be meant the sole presbyter, or minister of the congregation of Christians at Ephesus.

'The angel of the Church must, of consequence, have been the superintendent presiding over the presbyters, as well as over the flock.

'This establishment was not new. It had subsisted for some time in the Church of Ephesus, as I have already shown, when

¹ Acts xix. 8—10. 26.

² Acts xx. 17.

describing from the Scriptures the authority which St. Paul had delegated to Timothy. He had been left by the Apostle at Ephesus, to superintend the teaching and the conduct of the presbyters in that part; and to ordain others, as the state of the Church might require.

‘The Epistle of St. John to the Church of Ephesus shows, that the same authority which St. Paul had delegated to Timothy, was possessed by the angel of the Church who resided at Ephesus when the Apocalypse was written¹.

‘When St. Paul appointed Timothy and Titus to be superintendents, or bishops, over other presbyters, he gave them minute directions for the regulation of their conduct in that important office. It was not necessary that such directions should be given to the angels of the seven Churches in Asia, as they were already settled officers in the Christian Church, and were in the actual exercise of those powers which St. Paul committed to Timothy and Titus. We must not, therefore, expect to find the duties of a superintendent amply displayed in these short epistles to the angels of the seven Churches, as this had been already executed in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. St. John was led to mention the duties of the office only incidentally, as the persons who now held it required praise or reproof, according to their respective conduct in the execution of that office. But the incidental mention of the peculiar functions of the office, affords as clear a proof that it was held by the persons addressed, as is afforded by the more minute description contained in the Epistles to Timothy and Titus.

‘Nothing can prove more clearly that the angel of the Church of Ephesus was the superintendent of other ministers, than the notice which is taken of his authority to try the pretensions of those who laid a claim to the highest office in the Christian

¹ Revelation ii. 2.

Church. "Thou hast tried them which say they are Apostles, and are not; and hast found them liars¹." The angel of this Church had exercised his superintending authority with zeal and discretion, and now receives the approbation of his conduct from the great Head of the Church, through the hands of the Apostle.

'The same authority is recognized with respect to the angel of the Church at Thyatira, but in a way of reproof, instead of commendation. For, after the Apostle had expressed our Lord's approbation of his faith and patience, &c. it is added, "Notwithstanding I have a few things against thee, because thou sufferest that woman Jezebel, who calleth herself a prophetess, to teach," &c. Now it could not have been the subject of blame in the angel of the Church in Thyatira, that he suffered this pretended prophetess to exercise her talents among the Christians in that city, or district, unless he had possessed the authority of examining the pretensions of those who laid claim to the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Spirit, and of silencing improper teachers; which, as hath been already shown, were the functions of a superintendent; that is, of a minister in the Christian Church, who, ever since the apostolic age, has received the title of bishop.

'From these passages of Scripture I am convinced, that Diocesan Episcopacy² was established by Divine authority in the Christian Churches in Asia, before the death of the Apostle John; and I can find no reason from Scripture to think that the government of the Churches in Asia differed from that of other Christian Churches. They were all under the care of the same

¹ 'Revelation ii. 2.'

² 'By diocesan episcopacy, I mean the government of the Church by superintendents or bishops, each presiding over his own district, though subject to a general synod of bishops and presbyters. Acts xv. 6; xvi. 4.'

persons¹; matters of great concern, respecting them universally, were determined by a synod of the Apostles and presbyters at Jerusalem²; and the decrees made for the government of the Churches were distributed by Paul and Silas, as they went about preaching the Gospel³.

‘ My duty to the great Head of the Church compels me to respect that authority which appears to me so clearly to have been established by his direction; and I pray God, that this authority may always be exercised for the benefit of his “Church, which he hath purchased with his own blood;” that it may be presented to him at length, “a glorious Church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but holy and without blemish⁴.” ’

No. VI.

On the validity of the Ordination of the Anglican Church.

Analysis of Le Courayer's Defence.

IN order to understand Le Courayer's book, the reader must refer to the short statement of the dispute from Archbishop Bramhall, given above, which will show why it was necessary to prove the points enumerated below. I need only add generally, that there were two commissions issued for Parker's consecration, one dated September 9, 1559, not acted on, the other dated Dec. 6, following. The first was directed to six bishops, of whom three refused to act. The second to seven bishops, of whom

¹ “That which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches.”
2 Cor. xi. 28.’

² ‘Acts xv. 6.’

³ “And as they went through the cities, they delivered them the decrees for to keep, that were ordained of the Apostles and presbyters which were at Jerusalem.” Acts xvi. 4.’

⁴ ‘Ephes. v. 27.’

four, viz Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgskins, consecrated Parker.

- (1.) HE undertakes to show the authenticity of the registers in which Parker's consecration is registered.
- (2.) He exposes the Nag's-head story.
- (3.) He shows that the ordination at Lambeth is as authentic as an historical fact can be.
- (4.) He examines the objections.
- (5.) He examines Barlow's case.
- (6.) He examines the case of Scory, and the other bishops.
- (7.) From the *fact* he comes to the *right*, and examines what concerns the *forms*.
- (8.) He enquires into the matter of lay authority.

As preliminary matter, it may be well to notice (1.) that many Romanists have allowed the validity of English ordination.— See, for example, Cudseuius de Desp. Calv. Causæ, c. xviii. p. 468. Valesius de Min. Aug. p. 14. Arnaud MS. Lett. of Feb. 4, 1685. Snellart's MS. Lett. March 2, 1685, and even Bossuet.

(2.) It is curious that they who attacked the English ordinations did so inconsistently.

First, they alleged that King Edward's ritual for ordinations was bad. Next, they said that bishops consecrated by men who were separate from the Church, and had no authority or jurisdiction, were no bishops, confounding the difference between the powers of ordination and of jurisdiction. Then marriage, they said in their ignorance, made the consecration of bishops void. Ashamed of all these stories, they next said that the new bishops had not been consecrated at all by imposition of hands. Finally, they brought up the Nag's-head story. This story was *first* told by a Jesuit called Sacro Bosco, or Holywood, in 1604, forty-five years after Parker's consecration! Kellison, a Romanist

writer, knew nothing of this story in his *first* book, but published it in his *second* !

This story states in substance, that Parker, Sands, Horn, Jewel, Grindal, and Cox, not being able to find any bishops willing to consecrate them when the Queen had issued her commission in September, 1559, met at a tavern called the Nag's-head, in Cheapside ; that the bishop of Llandaff was present, but was prevented from assisting by a threat from Bonner, who had sent his chaplain Neal to be present ; and that finally Scory (whom the Romanists did not allow to be a bishop) made the several persons go on their knees, and then raised them, saluting each with the title of the bishopric to which he had been appointed. There are various editions of this story, but this is the substance of it. The variations show its falsehood.

Of course, they who admit this silly story, deny the validity of the registers of the consecrations of Parker and the others, which record their several consecrations at different times. Let us first look to this point.

(1.) The registers of the bishops of England are under the custody of a sworn public officer ; their authority is acknowledged, and their evidence admitted in courts of justice ; they are public repositories in which the ordinations, institutions, collations, &c. of clergy, are kept and entered *at the time they take place* ; they are always written in the time of the bishop whose name they bear, and are distinguishable by the writing and ink ; they bear frequently a relation to royal and national archives, which thus attest their fidelity. Faults and omissions doubtless exist in them, but so they do in all archives, and such faults do not in any degree weaken their general authority.

If the English bishops' registers are spurious, when did the forgery begin ? They are far older than the Reformation. At Lambeth they reach to the 13th century. (So at Chichester, and elsewhere.)

If Parker's and Cranmer's registers are false, so must those of the other churches which agree with them, and so must the royal archives, the acts of convocation, journals of parliament, and registers of the house of Lords. So must all the leases, exchanges, collations, &c. a great many of which remain to this day under the name of these bishops. That is to say, in the registers of Canterbury are found acts done first by the chapter of Canterbury down to the time of Parker's consecration, and afterwards by him in the administration of certain sees then vacant; and these acts continue down to the time when the appointments and consecrations of bishops for these sees are alleged to have been made. Now, the registers of these sees agree with the register of Canterbury. For example, the chapter, or Archbishop of Canterbury, administered Salisbury down to a certain time; and after that time we find the consecration, &c. of the Bishop of Salisbury in the register of Canterbury, and then we find in the Salisbury register his beginning to act there.

Again, when a bishop is elected, the act of election goes to the king, and the secretary of state draws an order to the metropolitan to confirm and consecrate the bishop elect. This is signed by the king, sealed with his little seal, sent to the keeper of the privy seal, who draws another order, sealed with the privy seal, to the keeper of the great seal, who sends an order sealed with the great seal to the metropolitan. A minute of all these remains in the office through which each goes. How could all these be forged? Yet, if Parker and the others were appointed at the Nag's-head, *all these must have been forged.*

Sanders himself allows (de Schism. Ang. l. iii. p. 344) that the bishops, in Queen Elizabeth's time, *were ordained* by certain persons, and by a certain rite, according to the *established ritual*, (*ritu certo secundum leges regni*,) and so say the act of parliament of 1566, and the acts in the registers. If this is true, the

Nag's-head story is necessarily false. In the very beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, doubts arose as to the validity of the consecrations. But those doubts rested wholly on the omission of the Roman ritual, and do not set up this absurd story.

What is the proof on the other side? Simply, that Stapleton, Weston, and Sanders, assert that down to 1566 the bishops exercised their office without *any* episcopal consecration, and took possession of their sees in 1566, by act of parliament only.

Yet this seemed to themselves so absurd, that the party felt the necessity of inventing the Nag's-head story. The truth was, that these writers meant to deny the fact that the bishops who consecrated Parker, &c. were real bishops.

It is said, indeed, that the registers have been suspected from the first. But why? It is too absurd to say, that they are produced by heretics, and not till long after the time. The ground alleged (falsely, as will be shown,) is; that one consecration is put after another, when it should have been before it. If the charge were true, would this be sufficient ground? When several acts of the same kind take place together or nearly so, how often does the keeper from carelessness omit one and then insert it, or enter them in wrong order!

But with all the splitting of parties in England, how is it that not one act can be produced, which contradicts or disagrees with these registers? And if the bishops were all appointed together at the Nag's-head in September, why did they date their consecrations in their several registers some in December, some in January, and why represent it according to King Edward's ritual rather than any other form? what interest could they have had in all this?

The objectors never *saw* the registers; nay! refused to see them when offered. They do not go so far after all as to *assert* their falsehood, but say they *may* be false.

But let us go into particulars. First, Le Quien notices Ridley,

whose consecration is given in Cranmer's register, and was never doubted for two hundred years. The objection made to his having been consecrated is, that he would have been consecrated according to the old ritual, and yet in Mary's reign he was only degraded from the priesthood. The register mentions that he *was* consecrated according to the old ritual. But then as the Romanists would not, at that time, allow any consecrated during King Edward's time, as Ridley was, to be bishops, so they would not degrade him of course from the episcopal office.

As to Ferrar, Le Quien falsely asserts that Heylin puts his consecration in 1547, for he says the *very* contrary, making it in 1548, and contradicting Fox's *Acts and Monuments*. Then Le Quien says, that he sat in parliament in 1547, therefore the register which places his consecration in 1548 must be false. But the fact is, that it is false that he sat in parliament at the time alleged. Rymer has published his nomination to the bishopric in July 1, 1548. Some authors have certainly placed his consecration in 1549, but that is not the fault of the registers, nor are we concerned to defend those authors. The fact is, that in most cases Le Quien has found fault with the registers, because the dates given in them do not tally with Godwin, in his first edition. Now in his second edition, Godwin *generally* agrees with the registers, having rectified his former errors.

But the fact is, that Godwin in his first edition disagrees with the dates of the registers *before* as well as *after* the Reformation. Would the Romanists infer that they too are false?

Then Le Quien says, that though Bishop Poynt was consecrated before Hooper, his consecration is in the page *after* Hooper's in Cranmer's register, which shows that the register is not exact. Le Quien has been misled by a faulty quotation of Mason. The fact is not so. For Poynt is in page 330, and Hooper in page 332.

As to the variation alleged about the suffragan bishop of Bedford, see below.

One of the great points insisted on by Roman Catholics is, that though the consecrations of the new bishops were so often attacked, the registers were not produced for fifty years; that the consecrations were defended on the ground of an apostolical doctrine and due discharge of functions; that when Parker's register was produced, some Roman Catholic priests, who were allowed to see it slightly, were refused a full examination of it; and that Mason durst not publish the contrary till after Abbot's death.

It is quite true that the registers were not published for many years. But the fact is, that such registers are rarely or never published. They are public repositories, kept to be consulted on occasions, to ascertain particular facts, institutions, collations, ordinations, visitations, mandates, &c. &c. But Parker's register, though not published, was quoted. There can be no reasonable doubt that these registers are alluded to in the act of parliament of 1566¹. (See Statutes at large, f. i. p. 815.) They are cited in Parker's Life, which was probably published in 1573, but at all events before 1575, and in Thynne's Catalogue of Archbishops of Canterbury, in Hollinshead, (p. 1491,) in 1586.

With respect to the further examination demanded by the priests, they wished to be *entrusted* with the registers, which was impossible. Le Quien says, that Mason dared not state this till after Abbot's death, as Abbot must have contradicted him, so that it is not in Mason's edition of 1625, but is in that of 1638. This is a positive falsehood. It is in the edition of 1625; the archbishop is appealed to, and the presentation copy to him is

¹ The act alludes to *records* which show that every thing in the consecration of bishops had been as duly and regularly done in the queen's time, or more so, than in her father's and brother's. Now no *records* but bishops' registers could be referred to, to prove such a point, because no others contain the proof of them.

now in the Lambeth library! There is reason, indeed, to believe, that there was *no* edition in 1638, the bookseller having printed only a fresh title-page in that year. In truth, not only is the archbishop appealed to, but in a marginal note it is stated that *before credible witnesses* he confirmed the fact.

But, next, what good would the early production of the registers have done in the dispute? The objections made *at first* were, (1.) that the bishops were not consecrated according to the canon and ritual of the Roman Catholic Church. (2.) That they were not consecrated according to the laws of the kingdom, but according to a rite of Edward VI., abrogated by Mary, and not restored by Elizabeth. (3.) That they were installed by a queen's order without the pope's bull. These were the several objections made before the Nag's-head story was invented. Now the production of the registers would not have answered these objections, nor shown that the ordinance was made according to the rituals, nor that Edward's ritual was restored, nor that there had been any bulls from the pope.

It is true that the letters of consecration were demanded, and that the registers were not produced. But why? They were demanded only to show that the bishop had been ordained by what the Roman Catholics called intruded bishops, and a ritual without authority, as is clear from Harding against Jewel. And these objections (though not valid) would not have been answered by producing the registers. Harding, for example, does not deny *all* imposition of hands, but a *legitimate* one. How would that have been answered by producing the registers? The grounds of objection were general; a change of doctrine, want of succession, separation from Rome, alteration of ritual, and mission from the sovereign. The registers could not have disproved these; therefore, though the letters of consecration might be asked for, it is clear that the production of the registers could have done no good.

We find that Harding attacked Jewel about the succession of the *doctrine* before he came to the vocation. When he did come to it, he said, that a bishop should be ordained by three bishops and with the pope's consent. Jewel allowed the first and denied the second. Harding objected that Jewel had not been consecrated. Jewel said that he had, by the metropolitan and other bishops, according to the canons. Harding did not deny this, but objected to the validity of the metropolitan's own consecration. It is quite clear that producing the registers would have done no good then. So in the dispute between Bonner and Horn, the objection to Horn's episcopacy was his consecration according to King Edward's ritual.

Thus we see why the registers were not produced, and that Le Quien misstated the dispute, which was not about proving *any* ordination but a *legitimate* one. The Nag's-head story had not then been heard of. The registers were the proper contradiction to that; and *as soon as it was brought forward, they were produced.*

The Nag's-head story rests on the supposition that there were no bishops to consecrate Parker. But this is absurd. There were plenty of Irish bishops who had been consecrated:—

(1.) Bale, as is clear from Ware's Catalogue of Irish bishops, where his consecration is given in detail; from Cox's Hist. of Ireland, p. 291; from Bale's own book, called "The Vocation of J. Bale, &c." p. 18, 19, which shows too that the consecration was by Edward's ritual; from Croke's Reports, part ii. p. 552, which show his consecration on Feb. 2, 1552-3; and from the Court Records of an action brought by Wheler, afterwards Bishop of Ossory, to get rid of some alienations made by the person intruded into the see by Queen Mary instead of Bale. Le Quien says that Edward's ritual was *not* introduced into Ireland; that Bale was not consecrated by the pontifical; and if by neither, not at all. But Edward's liturgy *was* introduced and

accepted. See the full account in Cox's History of Ireland, vol. i. p. 288—291. And if his liturgy was accepted, his ritual would not be refused. Bale expressly mentions the debate about it at his own consecration.

(2.) Corren, or Curvin, had been made Archbishop of Dublin by Mary, in 1555, and retired to the bishopric of Oxford in 1567. He then must have submitted and taken the oaths, as he could not have kept his old see, nor removed to the new, without so doing: indeed, in 1559 Elizabeth made him chancellor of Ireland, because he was of *sound doctrine*.

(3.) Rowland Baron, Archbishop of Cashel, was consecrated in 1553, and held the see till his death, in 1561.

(4.) C. Bodekine, Archbishop of Tuam, consecrated in 1534 as Bishop of Kilmacock, remained Archbishop of Tuam till his death, in 1572.

(5.) There were also the bishops of Ferns, Ossory, Limerick, Cork, Waterford, and Laone, under the same circumstances.

We know that all these *must* have submitted, for in the parliament of 1559, the same laws were passed for Ireland as to the oath of supremacy, liturgy, and ordinal, as for England; and (from Ware, de Præs. Hibern. p. 38 and 129,) we find that the bishops of Kildare and Meath were deprived for refusing the oath of supremacy. And a Roman Catholic writer says expressly, that the Irish bishops who refused the oath were deprived. (Annal. de Reb. Cathol. in Hib. p. 91.)

But there were bishops in England also:—

(1.) Coverdale, of Exeter, consecrated by Cranmer, Aug. 30, 1551, as appears from Cranmer's registers, and those of the chapter of Exeter, as well as Coverdale's own, there kept, in which every thing is dated from his consecration.

(2.) Scory was consecrated at the same time.

(3.) J. Hodgskins, suffragan bishop of Bedford, was also consecrated on Dec. 9, 1537, (as appears by Cranmer's registers,)

by the bishops of London, Rochester, and St. Asaph. See Strype's *Cranmer*, p. 63. In Henry VIII.'s reign this suffragan bishop ordained very often *for Bonner*, in the Diocese of London, and assisted at the consecration of many bishops, often with Bonner. And so in King Edward's reign. And Parker employed him, after there were many new bishops, at consecrations. Thus there were four bishops actually in London, without Barlow or the Bishop of Llandaff, viz. Bale, who came over to England on Edward's death, Coverdale, Scory, and Hodgskins. Indeed there was another, the suffragan bishop of Thetford; he was consecrated by Cranmer March 19, 1535; was deprived of the deanery of Norwich by Queen Mary; made bishop of Sodor and Man by Queen Elizabeth, his former consecration being mentioned in his nomination.

Thus the ground of the Nag's-head story is false. When there were thus at least five in England, and so many in Ireland, it is clear that Barlow's consecration at that time was not reckoned doubtful; else why have employed him? He was named in the first commission for Parker's consecration, on Sept. 9, with other Catholic bishops, when there were plenty of Catholic bishops *undeprived*. This would not have been if his consecration had been doubtful.

But the story itself is absurd and contradictory. There are nine or ten inconsistent versions of it. If true, the thing happened in Sept. 1559, yet was never heard of till 1604. Kellison, writing against the succession in the English Church, in 1603, does not notice it; in 1608 he does, though cautiously. If true, could Harding, Stapleton, &c. be ignorant of it? and would they, who were attacking Parker and Jewel, have been silent?

In 1562 the bishops in convocation, concerned to establish the validity of their consecration, authorize only that made by King Edward's ordinal. If the story were true, would this be possible?

But look shortly again at the story altogether. Le Quien says, that in Sept. 1589, the bishops nominated by Elizabeth, having applied in vain to the Archbishop of Armagh (Creagh), a prisoner in the Tower, met at a tavern (where was a chapel!), and on the Bishop of Llandaff's refusing to ordain them, from fear of Bonner, applied to Scory, who, taking them by the hand, saluted them as bishops, and they did the same for him.

Now for particulars as to time. The register of Canterbury shows that the dean and chapter administered the spiritualities, *sede vacante*, till Dec. 9, the day when Parker was confirmed. So in the register of the Prerogative Court, wills are proved by a commissary, *sede vacante*, till Dec. 10, when Parker is mentioned. From the 10th to the 17th he is called *elected and confirmed*. After the 17th those words are omitted. The register of administrations in Parker's time begins Dec. 9, 1559. Again, the dean and chapter of Canterbury had jurisdiction in other dioceses, *sede vacante*. And so at Salisbury, for instance, institutions are given by the metropolitan official as late as Dec. 7, and by Parker on Dec. 21, and up to Jan. 17. After Jan. 21, (when Jewel was consecrated) institutions, &c. are by Jewel. What can be clearer than this? The same is true of other dioceses.

As to there being no bishops, we have shown that that is untrue.

The story of the Irish Archbishop Creagh is as false as the rest. It is not indeed mentioned by some, and his name is not given by others. It happens, that of the four Irish archbishops three submitted, and continued archbishops in Elizabeth's time, the other died in 1558, in the Tower. The Roman Catholic archbishop named to succeed him was O'Teig; and Creagh succeeded him in 1563, and was imprisoned in 1564.

But mark what follows. The bishops meet at a tavern, when they had all the churches at their disposal. Bonner, though

in the Tower, hears of this, and sends his chaplain to excommunicate the bishop of Llandaff. The bishops let in this chaplain of a deprived bishop to excommunicate one of their own party, and after the excommunicated party had withdrawn in a fright, they let the chaplain stay to see their proceedings, when they had met at a tavern to keep them secret.

But if one must go on with this senseless story, why, if Scory, as they say, was only a simple priest, should he have been picked out? Why not Parker?

Again, when in the very last parliament the statute of 25th Henry VIII. had been revived, the neglect of which would have exposed them to lose their dignities, would they have neglected it?

Next, we may observe, that it is pretended that most of the new bishops were consecrated at that time, *i. e.* September. But it is certain from registers that they were not. For example, the commission for Sands' consecration is dated December 18, (see Rymer, t. xv. p. 555,) the mandate of the Archdeacon of Canterbury, for his installation (preserved at Worcester), on December 22. In Jewel's case, we find the see vacant, and the chapter of Canterbury exercising jurisdiction on Dec. 17, 1559—and the commission to consecrate him (Rymer, t. xv. p. 555,) is dated December 27, 1559. By Parker's register he was consecrated January 21. Nay, on January 6, Samson wrote to P. Martyr that Jewel would *soon* be consecrated—and up to January 17th, Parker administered the see as vacant. In Horn's case, the chapter of Canterbury exercised jurisdiction in his see as vacant in December, 1559—and the *congé d'élire* to his own chapter was not issued till that month. (Rymer, t. xv. p. 552.) More is superfluous.

The idle fancies that a tavern was chosen to prevent a tumult—that there was a chapel in it, &c. &c. are worthy of the rest of the story. It is curious, too, that no one knows how the story

arose. Of those who tell it, not one pretends to have been present. Neal and Stow, who are *said* to have been present, are silent, or contradict the story. For Stow says that Grindal was consecrated Dec. 21, 1559. As to Neal, if he had been present, he would certainly have told Bonner, and Bonner, when he objected to the validity of Horn's ordination, would have mentioned it. But he *did not*, and rests the whole on Horn's being ordained by Edward's ritual, which was not restored by authority of parliament when Horn was consecrated. And besides this, if Neal knew it in 1559, how was he silent for thirty or forty years about it? It is doubtful whether Neal was even with Bonner at the time. For though his chaplain, yet on Queen Elizabeth's accession, he retired to Oxford, where, in 1559, he was made Regius Professor of Hebrew.

We may now observe, that no Roman Catholic writer before 1600 notices the story—nay, that Stapleton, writing in 1566 against *Horn*, one of the very bishops alleged to be consecrated at the tavern, allows that the English bishops were ordered according to King Edward's ritual. We may observe, too, generally, that the Roman Catholic writers looked upon a consecration by bishops not Catholic, or without the Pope's mission and bulls, or by a ritual different from that of the Roman Catholic Church, as no consecration. And, therefore, their speaking indifferently as they do of the English bishops as having no ordination—no lawful ordination—an ordination without imposition of hands, or with unlawful imposition of hands, an ordination without bishops, or by false bishops,—all this tallies with the facts of an ordination at Lambeth, but *not* with the Nag's-head story, which implies that there was no ordination at all. Stapleton says to Horn that he is no bishop, because he has not the *usual* and *approved* ordination. Harding says the same in substance to Jewel. Jewel answers that all is done regularly in the English Church, and the bishops duly consecrated by the metropo-

litan and bishops, as he was himself. Does Harding mention in reply the Nag's-head story, or say that Jewel had not been consecrated at all, or that the Archbishop had never been consecrated? No! he only says that the Archbishop had not been *lawfully* consecrated.

Sanders again says, that the bishops were obliged to have recourse to parliament to confirm them, 'if any thing had been done wrong or contrary to law in their former *inauguration*.' He, therefore, allows that a consecration took place. Of course, like other Roman Catholic writers, not allowing the persons who performed it to be bishops, he speaks of the new bishops as made without episcopal consecration.

Thus Stapleton, Harding, and Sanders make no mention of the Nag's-head story, and what they say as to an unlawful ordination contradicts it. So of Osorius.

But it is said that Lord Audley heard Bishop Morton, in 1642, in the house of Lords, admit the Nag's-head story—that the Jesuits had heard of some such thing, and mentioned it in a work published at Rouen, in 1657—that the English made Morton disown his words—that then Lord Audley made his name known in a public declaration—that it was printed in a work at Antwerp, in 1659—and that Morton and Bramhall never denied it.

But this declaration is not *signed, dated, nor authenticated* by any public officer—nor certified as true by any person of note—nor produced by any *known* writer at first. The original is not known to exist—the copy is authorized by no one. Mr. Fennel has put the signature *Audley*. But there is *no signature* in the book from which he took it. And it appears that Lord Audley always signed Castlehaven Audley. (See his *Memoirs*, t. ii. p. 129, and Cox's *History of Ireland*.)

Next, Le Quien says, six times over, that Morton's speech was in 1642. Now the bishops withdrew from parliament in December, 1641, and came there no more. And from Lord

Audley's own Memoirs, it appears that he left England in 1641, and was in Ireland till 1646. Nay, he asked leave to go to England in 1641, and it was refused.

But the whole story is senseless. Morton made this speech, it is said, to save the bishops from exclusion from parliament, and prove that they were true bishops. This he did, it seems, by saying that they were ordained by an apostate Monk at a tavern! Who will believe this?

Lord Say (a strong parliamentary) stated in a letter to a friend (Oct. 22, 1658), that Bishop Morton never said any thing of the sort, and that the whole was a mere invention. Yet he was a great enemy of the bishops, and would gladly have laid hold of such an argument. How happens it, too, that Lord Audley alone should remember so remarkable a fact? Fifteen temporal peers, and seven bishops, all present in that parliament, all declared, by a public document, that they had not the least remembrance of Bishop Morton's having stated so curious a fact, or that any book on the subject was presented in that session of parliament. And many other peers, absent when that document was signed, declared that they were ready in the same way to confound this falsehood. Lord Brudenall, the oldest peer in England, and a Roman Catholic, was so afraid that he should be reckoned the author of this falsehood, that he publicly contradicted it every where. Bishop Morton himself contradicted it in every form, and finally *in his will*. Now, even suppose that Lord Audley made such a declaration, compare its privacy with the public declaration of Bishop Morton, signed also by twenty-two peers, and courting publicity in every way. Which is most credible?

(4.) There is every possible mark of authenticity about the Lambeth consecration of Parker, in December, 1559. The registers of the Chapter and of the Prerogative Court, show that the Chapter administered the see till December; and on Dec. 11, Parker is

called Archbishop elect, in an act of the Prerogative Court. All the dates of his register afterwards assume December to have been the time of his consecration. In Nov. 1562, he called it the third year of his consecration.

We may remark in conclusion, that there is not a single record in existence *against* the consecration at Lambeth, or *for* the story of the Nag's-head. It is true, indeed, that there was a commission to consecrate *Parker only*, issued Sept. 9, to six bishops, and that such commissions ought to be executed in twenty days. But three of the bishops *refused to act*, and therefore this commission could not be executed. Besides which, it was for *Parker only*, and not for the rest alleged to have been consecrated at the Nag's-head, and it directs the consecration to be in the form required by the statute. If such ceremony had taken place at the Nag's-head in September, in consequence of the commission, how comes the see to be spoken of as vacant in royal records, as late as Oct. 9? (See Rymer, t. xv. p. 542, 3.)

Then the Roman Catholics allege a commission issued on Oct. 20, to certain persons to administer the oath of supremacy to others, and in this Parker, Grindal, and Cox, are called Archbishop of Canterbury, Bishops of London and of Ely. And they add that none but a consecrated bishop can administer such oath. Therefore they argue that the Nag's-head ordination in September did take place. But this is pure fancy. The statute of 1st Elizabeth allows *any* person appointed by the crown to administer the oath—and there were two commissions that very year where laymen are empowered to administer the oath even to bishops.

The only argument then is, that Parker is not called Archbishop *elect*, and so of the others. But though it is more usual to insert this word, it was often omitted. Thus Bonner was translated from Hereford to London, (before his consecration,) and though elected Oct. 20, 1539, he was not consecrated

till April 4, 1540. But in the patent enabling him to exercise jurisdiction, the word *elect* is omitted. (Burnet, Vol. i. App. p. 184.) And so in several other records about Bonner. Nay, he omits the word in describing himself. (See his Register.)

Besides this, in a letter of Jewel to P. Martyr, on Nov. 1559, he tells him that the new bishops were not *then* consecrated.

With respect to Grindal and Cox, we may here mention, that besides other proofs, the sees of London and Ely were administered by the chapter of Canterbury in November, nay, as late as Dec. 19 and Dec. 21, as appears from the Canterbury registers. Grindal, again, gives his proxy for taking possession of his cathedral (in which he mentions his consecration by Parker) on Dec. 22, and the Archdeacon of Canterbury's mandate for installing him is dated Dec. 28.

The dispute between Bonner and Horn deserves mention. The bishops were empowered to administer the oath of supremacy to those within their jurisdiction, and the Chancellor of Horn, Bishop of Winchester, tendered it to Bonner, then a prisoner in the Marshalsea. He refused it, because not described as Bishop of London, and because, as he alleged, Horn was not Bishop of Winchester, having been consecrated by King Edward's ordinal, which had been set aside by Mary, and not restored by statute. When the cause was tried, it was referred finally to parliament. The fact was, that by a statute of 1 Elizabeth, King Edward's order of prayer was restored, but the order for consecrating bishops was not *specifically* mentioned, as it was presumed to be contained in the general description. An act was therefore passed, declaring all consecrations made by that ordinal good and valid. The preamble of that act alone would destroy the Nag's-head story, for it says that there have been doubts, not whether the bishops were consecrated at all, but whether their consecration was *rightly* done, and as the statutes direct; *i. e.* whether, in

short, Edward's ordinal was the legal form—and (being in 1566) it speaks of all the consecrations since the beginning of the Queen's reign, making no distinction between Parker's and the others (many in number) which occurred up to 1566, very many of which even the Romanists would allow were by Edward's ordinal. It says, that every thing had been done in the most regular manner, and according to King Edward's ordinal, and declares such consecration legal. This act does not pretend to make invalid consecrations valid, but *declares* that the consecrations were valid by law before¹.

(5.) Le Courayer, in the latter part of his first volume, goes at great length into the proofs of the bishops who consecrated Parker, having been themselves rightly consecrated. But the objections to their consecration are so trifling, that it cannot be worth while to enter on the point at any length. Indeed, an argument on this subject, implies the falsehood of the Nag's-head story at once.

It may be sufficient to say, that though there is no record of Barlow's consecration, neither is there of that of Gardiner, and many others, of that time; but that there is ample proof of his having been appointed bishop in 1536, early after Henry's breach with the Pope, when that King was especially particular in matters of form, and would as soon have dreamt of letting his yeomen of the guard act as bishops, as a person who had not been consecrated—that he sat in parliament immediately after, was translated to various bishoprics, assisted repeatedly at consecrations, was allowed by Mary to be a true bishop, she having accepted his *resignation*, and, as is allowed by the Romanists

¹ This explains a difficulty started to me once in conversation by a learned Romanist, who despised the Nag's-head story, and was well inclined to admit the validity of our orders. But he said that it had always struck him as singular that there should be an Act of Parliament to *establish* the validity of the consecrations, unless some doubt about the point had been felt.

themselves, that he passed as a bishop during his whole life, and for two hundred years after¹. To dispute his consecration is idle. The records of the consecration of Scory exist. Of Coverdale and Hodgskins we have spoken before.

(6.) Now, as to the *forms* of Edward's ordinal. The Romanists endeavoured to show that this ordinal was bad, because it does not *expressly* mention the principal function or chief effect of ordination. But it is proved by the best authorities and undoubted examples, that prayer is the form of ordination—that this form is not confined to any one fixed prayer, nor to the words of the pontifical, nor to those of forms of later date—that the end of a sacrament need not be expressed in its form, as is shown by the forms of baptism and confirmation, which express only the action of the minister—and that in many of the ancient forms of ordination there is no mention of the sacrifice. All that is required is, that the form should have some relation to the effect. Now four out of five of the functions mentioned in the pontifical are mentioned also in Edward's ordinal, viz. baptizing, preaching, blessing, and presiding; and the *offering* the Eucharist, is denoted both by the terms of administering the sacraments, and the invariable custom of the Church, which allows Priests only to offer the Eucharist. Whether the English *call* the Eucharist a *sacrifice* can be of no matter. They consecrate the bread and wine by the words of Jesus Christ, which is all that the Fathers required for the *form* of the Eucharist. They represent and commemorate the death of Christ, and offer to God under these symbols the death of his Son, begging that those who receive them may enjoy its effects. And whatever this is *called* by the

¹ Kennett has attempted to prove that Barlow was in Scotland at the only time that he could have been consecrated, viz. from February to the end of April, 1536. But all this is Kennett's own blunder or falsehood. It can be proved from Buchanan that he went the preceding *November*; and the record of his *confirmation*, on April 21, mentions his then being personally present.

English, it is the offering which Christ ordained ; the name by which it is called can be of no moment. The English never allow this to be offered by any but the Priest. Their intention, then, in *ordination* is clear ; they intend by that rite to make a person capable of consecrating the Eucharist.

Their ordinal is changed in form, no doubt, as many other ordinals (nay, the Roman one itself) have been, but what is *essential* to the ordination, the prayer, imposition of hands, &c. is *not* changed. Again, it is said, that as the English have separated, they cannot have the same intention as the Church in ordination. The answer to this is given, in fact, by Bellarmine, when he says that it is enough to *intend* what the *true* Church, *whatever it is*, intends. That they altered some things, as tending to favour errors (which even the Romanists disown), is true, but they intend still to make Priests to consecrate the Eucharist, and to give them all the powers given by the institution of Jesus Christ. Whether they *call* it a sacrifice or not, is a dispute of names, not things.

Some of the Romanists insist on the delivery of the instruments of consecration, which is practised by them, as essential. But the only things *universally* received, and therefore essential, are *prayer* and *laying on of hands*. The Greek Church does not deliver the instruments, and to account for this, some Romanists say that Christ made a double institution, one for the Western Church, and the other for the Eastern ; others, that the Roman Church granted the Eastern a dispensation for this matter, though the Greek Church ordained before the Roman Church was in existence. Nothing is wanted but *proof* for these theories.

Then again, even in the Latin Church, some old formularies do not contain the delivery of the instruments.

The Romanists next say, (1.) that the Church of England received this rite of ordination from Rome, and could not, therefore, abrogate it. How does this appear ? She did not receive it

by force, but choice. The *discipline* of one Church is no rule for others. And these variations are in discipline only. Then (2.) they say, that the Church of England is a part of the Church of Rome, which is the universal Church, and having received jointly with her an addition, (which the Church of Rome had a right to make, and the defect of which, if she pleases, can invalidate the sacrament,) can have no right herself to alter it. But it is absurd to argue that the Church of Rome, *i. e.* a particular Church, can be an universal one. She may be the head, or first member, but cannot be the whole Church. The union of other Churches with her is one of association and subordination, but not dependence. She cannot force them to submit to her discipline, which can only have authority by their own will. She may enforce laws received by the *whole* Church. But this cannot be said of the rites of ordination; for those of the West differ from those of the East. Besides, every national Church has powers to vary the matters of discipline, and a power of inspection does not destroy that right. In fact, in the Eucharist itself, so far from Rome insisting on her rite being used, there are *four* forms, viz. the Roman, Ambrosian, Gallican, and Mozarabian. Nor is the Western Church one Church. These very varieties prevail in Spain and France. And so in the East there were many forms, though Constantinople was the superior Church. Neither can it be alleged that the Church in a body, and not particular Churches, received the right of settling matters omitted by the Head of the Church, and that the contrary notion would bring in as many forms and matters, and as many sacraments, as Churches. For we are speaking of *discipline*, not of *essentials*, and a variation of rite does not alter the ceremony. We do not find again that the Church, *as a body*, determined *such* points, but left them of course to particular Churches. This does not give the right of altering what is part of the institution, as the laying on of hands at ordination. The question

may be fairly asked, whether the Church of Rome has ever declared ceremonies, which she has added for solemnity, to be of the *essence* of the sacrament. She may make them essential for *herself*, because that is perhaps the right of each Church—and she may reject from the exercise of the ministry *in* her Church, those who do not use them. But that is all. Once for all, the *matter* in ordination is the laying on of hands, which is the original institution, and has been the universal practice. The Church cannot add to an institution; nor is there any law on part of the universal Church on the point. What she added, she never declared necessary, and has always admitted ordinations where these additions were not accepted.

The English then have preserved the only essential *matter*. As to form, their prayer is confessedly equivalent to the Greek and Roman, and they have retained more than a mere analogy to the effect of the ordination. As to the *intention*, they intend to communicate all the ordinary power conferred by Christ on his apostles, and to do what the Church does.

The Romanists then advert to what they think the errors of the English, as to the sacrifice in the Eucharist. But the errors of ancient heretics were never thought to invalidate their sacraments. The baptism of the Pelagians, for example, although they do not own the efficacy of the rite, was not rejected. And so of the Zuinglian baptism, which was decided by Pius V.; and again in France, in the Synod of Evreux, in 1576. The Nestorian and Eutychian errors certainly destroy the nature of the Eucharist, yet their ordinations are admitted. Why not the English? To this it is replied—The ancient heretics did not alter the *form*, the English have, in order to propagate their errors; and their error about the Eucharist is only noticed to show that they have altered their forms. This is a mere fallacy, for the truth is, that the English form *is* rejected, on account of the error with which the English are charged as to the sacrifice.

The alteration of the form is only the pretended cause of rejection. Mr. Snellart allows, too, that if the English form were used in the Catholic Church, it would be valid. It is condemned, therefore, solely because it does not notice *the sacrifice*, an omission not essential, and practised in ancient forms of very good authority. So that the alleged error in faith is in reality the cause why the ordination is rejected; or in other words, the destructive principle is introduced of making a sacrament depend on the faith of the minister.

(7.) Le Courayer here goes at great length into the question of the *sacrifice*, as debated between the Churches, and contends that the English have, in fact, a sacrifice. But as he acknowledges (what is, indeed, manifest,) that this is beside the question, I omit it.

He then goes on to show that the English have a *Priesthood*, have always in their Liturgy claimed the character of priests for their ministers, and in the ordination given them the power of priests, viz. *the power of the keys*, as well as that of preaching, presiding, and blessing. The Eucharist, as we observed, is not expressly mentioned; nor is baptism, &c. in the pontifical. But the English order gives the power of administering *the sacraments*, and the confessions of the English Church say that they are Baptism and the Lord's Supper. In ordaining deacons, too, the power of *baptizing* and of *assisting* the priest at the Eucharist, is expressly given.

The English object to certain claims on part of the Roman priesthood, but always acknowledge and claim a priesthood. To say that their errors about the sacrifice prevent them from having a priesthood, is absurd. Whatever they call it, they have in the Eucharist what Christ ordained; and it must be repeated that an error in faith on part of the minister cannot invalidate the sacrament. The consistent Romanist must therefore allow that the English have (what he thinks necessary) a sacrifice. Indeed, to say that the English have no priesthood

because no sacrifice, is making the cause depend on its effect, for the priesthood is prior to the sacrifice.

It is not true that the English Church ever knowingly admitted persons who had not been ordained by a bishop. Tricks may have been played in Elizabeth's time, but a deception or evasion of the law proves nothing.

It can hardly be worth while to notice the objection that Calvin was concerned in the English liturgy. If it is defensible in itself, its author can be of no consequence. But Calvin had nothing to do with it, nay, spoke of it as containing ineptiæ and the dregs of Romanism. The liturgies of all the Churches where he had influence are wholly different, and the non-conformists of his party always opposed it violently. The history of Hooper's consecration alone would show how little Calvin was attended to.

It is true enough that the English consecrations were much rejected by Roman divines at first—but that proves nothing; besides which they were not *universally* rejected.

Hooper was only degraded from the Priesthood, it is true, but this was the case also with three others, consecrated by the pontifical. It is not clear, then, that his consecration was thought null on any other ground than theirs, viz. their being consecrated in schism. Ridley's episcopacy was acknowledged, by the way, on his trial, by the Bishop of Lincoln, Sept. 30, 1555, though the Bishop of Gloucester would not allow it. It is curious, too, that in Mary's reign, among the hundreds of *deprivations, suspensions, &c.* (now in existence) there is not one on pretence of want of ordination, nor is any re-ordination prescribed. The Catholics allege a dictum of a Chief Justice Brook, as to the nullity of the ordinations in Edward's reign. But this was in Queen Mary's time, and, no doubt, many Catholics thought as he did. That is not denied; but it proves nothing.

(8.) Le Courayer finally goes into the question of the interference of the King and parliament, in England, in ecclesiastical matters,

and the objection taken to King Edward's ordinal, because sanctioned by act of parliament. He shows at great length that it was entirely drawn up by the clergy, and that parliament interfered in no way, except in making what the clergy had done the law of the land—that in very many instances this has been done in Roman Catholic countries, (for example, in France, where a change of liturgy was sanctioned by Henry IV., and could not be effected without his sanction, and so on)—and that there is no doubt that Pius IV. offered to sanction the English liturgy, if Elizabeth would accept it from him, or that, till she was excommunicated, many Roman Catholics regularly attended the English service. But these things, though interesting, are not necessary to this inquiry.

No. VII.

Observations on matters of detail in Church government.

WHEN it is argued that one man has as much right as another to teach, and that Church government is therefore the mere dictate of expediency, the obvious reply is, that no man has any right by nature to minister in sacred things; and that they who thus argue either forget that there is such a thing as Scripture, or forget to look in it for what it is reasonable to suppose it will contain,—direction in such matters. How can they expect, unless they expressly reject Scripture, and have to deal with those who do so likewise, that what Scripture says, if it says any thing on the matter, shall be overlooked or set aside in favour of their notions and constitutions? Now the fact is, that rightly or wrongly, it is believed by an overwhelming majority of Christians, that Scripture does say something on this point; and when that belief is established, the human system must fall to the ground, and be without any authority at all. It cannot stand beside the word and law of God. But how does this apply to

the case before us? We believe that God has laid down a scheme of Church government, and that it is in virtue of a commission from him that the Minister teaches. How then can human authority interfere with him, or limit his privileges? Clearly thus. God has laid down only the great features of a scheme of Church government, and has left it to man to make those necessary arrangements and those necessary variations of arrangement, which the varying condition of human society requires. It is needless to go into proof of a position which has been argued fully by Hooker in his Third Book against the Puritans; to any but enthusiasts his reasoning must, I think, be convincing. The sum of it he states thus, § 11, near the end: ‘The matters wherein Church polity is conversant, are the public religious duties of the Church, as the administration of the word and sacraments, prayers, spiritual censures, and the like; to these the Church standeth always bound. Laws of polity are laws which appoint in what manner these duties shall be performed; in performance whereof, because all that are of the Church cannot jointly and equally work, the first thing in polity required is a difference of persons in the Church, without which difference these functions cannot in orderly sort be executed. Hereupon we hold that God’s clergy are a state which hath been, and will be, as long as there is a Church upon earth, necessary, by the plain word of God himself; a state whereunto the rest of God’s people must be subject, as touching things that appertain to their souls’ health. For where polity is, it cannot but appoint some to be leaders of others, and some to be led by others. If the blind lead the blind, they both perish. It is with the clergy, if their persons be respected, even as it is with other men, their quality many times far beneath that which the dignity of their place requireth. Howbeit, according to the order of polity, they being the lights of the world, others (though better and wiser) must that way be subject unto them. Again, forasmuch

as where the clergy are any great multitude, order doth necessarily require that by degrees they be distinguished ; we hold there have ever been, and ever ought to be in such case, at leastwise two sorts of ecclesiastical persons, the one subordinate unto the other, as to the Apostles in the beginning, and to the Bishops always since, we find plainly, both in Scripture and in all ecclesiastical records, other ministers of the word and sacraments have been. Moreover, it cannot enter into any man's conceit to think it lawful that every man which listeth should take upon him charge in the Church ; and therefore a solemn admittance is of such necessity that without it there can be no Church polity. A number of particularities there are which make for the more convenient being of these principal and perpetual parts in ecclesiastical polity, but yet are not of such constant use and necessity in God's Church : of this kind are times and places appointed for the exercise of religion, specialities belonging to the public solemnity of the word, the sacraments and prayer, the enlargement or abridgment of functions ministerial, depending upon those two principles before mentioned. To conclude, even whatsoever doth by way of formality and circumstance concern any public action of the Church now, although that which the Scripture hath of things in the former kind be for ever permanent, yet in the latter both much of that which the Scripture teacheth is not always needful, and much the Church of God shall always need which the Scripture teacheth not.' Indeed, if we consider the declaration of Scripture, that 'the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets, for God is not the author of confusion but of peace in the Churches,' (1 Cor. xiv. 32, 33,) and then consider the endless variety and change of circumstances occurring in a system so extensive and of such duration as human society, we cannot fail to see what must be the will of God in this matter, nor to acknowledge that where an authority not in any thing contrary to Scripture exists, we

violate every tie of conscience when we transgress it. Now the minister of the Church of England has received his commission at the hands of his bishop: by the oaths he has taken, as well as by the service of ordination in which he partakes, and in which his commission is conferred, he has acknowledged the power of the bishop, and acknowledged too, *totidem verbis*, the bishop's power to appoint him to serve in a particular place; he has recognized, *totidem verbis*, the fact that certain people will be committed to his care and charge; and he has solemnly vowed to obey his ordinary. When he has thus confessed the existence of a legal authority, and vowed to obey it; when he knows that the same authority which has committed certain people to him, has committed all the people of the realm to others, and has done this to avoid confusion and produce peace; what can he say in his defence for violating this order, and putting his sickle into other men's harvest? 'Should a man,' I use the words of Mr. Sikes¹, 'should a man say with the saucy itinerant, that

¹ In an admirable work, called 'A Discourse on Parochial Communion,' p. 258. I would earnestly recommend the whole of it, and especially the chapter on 'the Pastor's right to minister to the People,' to all candidates for orders. I know that the laxest notions are entertained on this point; that such instances, for example, have occurred very recently, as deacons, when attending a bishop for examination, previous to their ordination as priests, exhorting in the inn near his residence, and defending their conduct for so doing. If this unfortunate tendency to mistake the extent of the ministerial commission and to violate the discipline of our Church could be got rid of, I think we might confidently hope that the doctrinal controversies which have agitated the Church would gradually die away. As a proof of the truth and justice of my complaint, I would beg to mention, that in some religious journal (but I really forget which) I have seen, since the first edition of this work, this practice openly avowed, and an attack on myself for having complained of it. What are we to say of those who, when actually under an inquiry of their fitness to exercise the Ministry, exercise it in the very teeth of the inquirers, in a place too where they would have no business to exercise it if their fitness was declared? Such things *have*

“he was ordained a priest of the Universal Church,” that “the whole world is his parish,” still it must be remembered that he accepted his post in that Church where the superior has power to deprive him of those dignities and privileges which he once conferred upon him. If he (the superior) withdraw his permission to speak in the Church, by what authority can he administer at all? Will he still persevere in officiating, as if no prohibition were against him? If a superior can deprive, *a fortiori*, he can limit and restrain¹.

happened, I believe, as deacons being rejected when they have applied for admission into priest's orders. And the persons exhorted would be singularly edified, no doubt, by the rejection of their exhorter.

It is easy to raise a cry, and accuse those who object to such practices of a lack of piety; yet, in spite of such a cry, I shall take leave to say that persons about to receive (what is, at least to less confident men,) the *awful* renewal of their ministerial commission, would be far better employed in recommending themselves and their own manifold needs and deficiencies to the throne of grace in private, than in parading their gifts to a flock already committed to other hands.

¹ It may appear somewhat strange to allude to passing events in a book like the present, but the principles involved in the short discussion which follows are of *permanent* interest. There is an anxious desire at present to have a statute which shall enable persons to build and endow chapels, and nominate the ministers of them, without leave of bishop, patron, or incumbent. The want of sufficient church room, the danger of leaving the people without instruction, or to irregular instruction, are the pleas, and, no doubt, the strong pleas, in favour of the plan recommended. But it is a terrible plan to cure one evil at the expense of a greater: and if the destruction of the principle on which the whole system of our Church polity is founded, be looked on as a greater evil than those alluded to, such would be the case here. That principle is, that the bishop consigns to each appointed clergyman a distinct and clearly defined flock, that he is bound to teach them, and that they are to look to him for light. Here are clear co-relative duties, and such duties *can* be discharged. If a second teacher is sent into the same charge, with no dependence on the first, the whole must, in many cases, be one scene of confusion. Men are men, and jealousies will arise; men are men, and they

There are some observations by Balguy on the main point here noticed, which appear to me very sophistical: he is arguing

will and do differ on certain great points of doctrine. With separate and defined duties (as in adjoining parishes) they might, though differing, combine for many important purposes. With a common and undefined scene of action they will perpetually come into collision. The case will not be, as is supposed, that the one will go where the other cannot, and teach those whom the other cannot. It cannot but be that, conscientiously differing, each will feel himself almost compelled to keep on the very same ground as the other, to check or repair the other's errors, to visit the same cottages, and pray by the same sick beds. This has been, and often will be. Differences will rise into party feeling, the flock will be divided by the same differences, and ranged under the banners of the contending leaders, and so God's heritage, instead of a well ordered and peaceful land, will be a scene of strife and carnal anger. That these are not mere fancied evils, that they must often arise if such a statute be ever passed, no common observer of men and things will dispute. There are some evils more formidable in theory than in practice, but I can truly say, that this would be an evil which, in my own case, I should not know how to meet; I should, I trust, earnestly *endeavour* to avoid party animosity; but, to take a single example, being myself an anti-Calvinist, if I found that close to my own Church, and to my own people, Calvinistic doctrines were taught, could I, and ought I, as the appointed pastor of the flock, be silent, and let what I conscientiously believe false be taught them? Must not the Calvinist say the same?

Who can doubt that it is one main object of our system to prevent such evil? Who can deny that it is prevented, as things are, and that the evils complained of *might be cured* without subverting that system? Is it wise, is it *right*, to give up an essential principle in order to cure evils which might be cured in other ways? What good can ever come of such proceedings, either in blessing from God, or even in worldly success? If the principle be evil, in God's name, give it up to-morrow; have no parishes, no defined duties, but turn all the shepherds loose to look after what part of the flock they, in their wisdom and their zeal, may choose to select. But if this would be madness, then, in God's name, preserve the principle which prevents it. If parishes are too large for one minister, get Acts to *divide* them, or build additional churches dependent on the mother church; or, finally, *annex a district* to each fresh chapel, so that the duties of the incumbent and

very justly against those who think themselves at liberty to preach in opposition to the faith of their Church ; but he adds, that men are not bound to explain or defend all the articles of religion. And he defends this by saying, (Vol. i. p. 105,) ‘ Here it will be urged by some persons, “ We are to obey God rather than man : a Christian minister is to preach the Gospel of Christ, not inculcate the doctrines of a National Church ; and it is his duty also to preach the whole Gospel, not confine himself to such parts of it as he finds to consist with human creeds and articles.” But how, I ask, did it become his duty ? He was once at liberty to choose whether he would preach any part of the Gospel : what is it that now binds him to preach the whole of it ? Certainly they who made him a preacher imposed no such obligation : they neither required nor authorized him to

the chaplain may be defined. This would obviate the objections which I have made. The only thing to be required further is, that justice be not forgotten. I know well that it is far easier to cry out, ‘ Here is a great occasion, here are important interests, here are souls at stake ; am I to regard private interests ? ’ The answer is briefly this—cannot the two objects be perfectly conciliated ? and, *if they can*, can we expect a blessing on our endeavours when we neglect *justice* on pretence of *piety* ? If the patron and incumbent have *no* real rights, they need not be considered ; if they *have*, I should be sorry, as a Christian, *unnecessarily* to violate or to neglect any man’s rights, and should not believe that I could promote Christianity by doing so, whatever appearances might be. What I ask, then, is, that it should be considered whether we cannot do our duty to the cause of the Gospel without injustice. If it can be shown that this is *impossible*, and yet that Christian duty requires us to do what will prejudice individuals, I contend no further. But I do not admire those who talk so coolly and contemptuously of the surrender of rights, when they are to be made not *by*, but *to*, themselves ! He who, from real piety, builds and endows a chapel, will never object to compensate those whom he would injure. He who builds a chapel for his own gain, or that of his family, should be made to give such compensation.

preach any other doctrine than is agreeable to the institutions of the Established Church.'

Such a statement is as mischievous as the error it opposes.— A Minister is bound indeed to teach the doctrine of the Church to which he belongs, and nothing else, but how does he justify the taking such an obligation on him? Certainly only by a conviction that the Church of which he becomes a Minister teaches the whole Gospel; or, in other words, that the view which it takes of the scheme of salvation in the Gospel, is that which, after due examination, he in his conscience believes to be true. What sort of a Church would that be which did not teach the whole Gospel? How could any good man become a Minister in it? How can any argument about such a Church be needful?

No. VIII.

On the Necessity of Learning in the Ministry.

'*We are Ambassadors for Christ.*—From which expression it is most evident that the ministry both requires the best and ablest, and deserves them; that the refuse and abjects of man cannot be worthy of it, nor it unworthy of the choicest. It requires able men, because they are to be ambassadors: and this will follow of itself. Again, consider whose ambassadors, and in what business? The ambassadors of the King of kings, in the weighty matter of treating peace betwixt Him and mankind. Shall it be said of His ambassadors, as Cato said to those who were sent by the Romans to Bithynia, counting that three wants were amongst them, viz. that they had neither feet, nor head, nor heart? It is true God may, and sometimes, especially in extraordinary times, does make use of unlettered and unqualified men, but then he inlays their defects by a singular

supply, therefore that is no rule for us in the ordinary vocation. It is a piece of God's prerogative to use unlikely means without disadvantage : anything is a fit instrument in his hands ; but we are to choose the fittest and best means, both in our own affairs, and in his service ; and if in any, this eminent service of embassy requires a special choice. If bodily integrity was necessary in the servers at the altar under the law, shall we think that the mentally blind and lame are good enough for the ministration under the Gospel, which exceeds in worth and glory ? Who is sufficient for these things ? saith the great Doctor of the Gentiles. Our practices seem to answer, any body.'—Leighton's Works, Vol. iii. p. 470.

'I confess,' says the great South, 'God has no need of any man's parts or learning ; but certainly then he has much less need of his ignorance and ill behaviour.'—Sermons, Vol. i. p. 149. This remark is followed by some others in his most caustic vein, on the evils of admitting ignorant men into the ministry ; and the concluding ones show what he thought of this separation of learning and piety :—'We have had almost all sermons full of gibes and scoffs at human learning. Away with vain philosophy, with the disputer, &c. Thus divinity has been brought in upon the ruins of humanity, by forcing the words of the Scripture from the sense, and then putting them to the worst of drudgeries, to set a *jus divinum* upon ignorance and imperfection, and recommend natural weakness for supernatural grace.'—South's Sermons, Vol. i. p. 153.

'Jerome (Ep. 2. ad Nepotianum) certainly says, '*Multo melius est e duobus imperfectis rusticitatem sanctam habere quam eloquentiam peccatricem*,' a remark to which all must subscribe. But if the sentence itself did not mark Jerome's recognition of the *imperfection* of both states, the preceding one would, where he says, '*Nec rusticus et tamen simplex frater ideo se sanctum putet si nihil noverit ; neé peritus et eloquens*

in lingua æstimet sanctitatem.' So Chrysostom (de Sac. iv. 8 and 9) expressly teaches that 'both a holy life and learning are required in a Priest—that each have their part in his office, and are necessary to assist each other in order to consummate men's edification.' He goes on to ask, what a good life can avail, if controversy as to doctrine arises, and Scripture is pleaded in behalf of error? Besides which he alleges, that if the people see their minister defeated in argument from his ignorance, they will think it is the badness of his cause which has caused his defeat. See too the passages quoted from Gregor. Naz. Orat. I. de Fuga (T. i. p. 22) in Bingham, Book vi. ch. 3.

Bishop Reynolds' words deserve to be transcribed—'When I consider all these things, I cannot but believe, that the more learned men are (having gracious hearts as well as learned heads) the more sensible they are of their own insufficiency for so tremendous an employment as the sound, solid, and judicious preaching of the word of God, and are more dismayed at the sense of their own wants for so weighty and arduous a service; that they do wonder at the boldness of illiterate men, who therefore venture with more confidence upon it, because they know not that variety of learning, as well as of spiritual wisdom and grace, is requisite unto such an able discharge of it, as whereby a man may appear to be "a workman who needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the word of truth." '—Bishop Reynolds' Sermon. x. Works, Vol. v. p. 38.

Bishop Jebb has stated this with his accustomed power of thought and eloquence. (Practical Theology, Vol. ii. pp. 190—192.) 'I am aware, indeed, that some of our profession hold the opinion, or at least act as though they held the opinion, that professional studies are to cease with the period of our admission into holy orders; and that thenceforward it is requisite to perform only the more active duties; that in fact the performance of those duties is incompatible with a life of studious

application; and that a clergyman is at liberty to *read little*, provided he *works much*. Not such, however, was the opinion of St. Paul: for we find him exhorting St. Timothy, not only to read, but to read with persevering diligence—St. Timothy, who had not only been raised to the highest order of the ministry, but who had received, in a miraculous manner, the gifts of the Spirit. Not such is the judgment of our Church: for we find her requiring, not only her deacons and her priests, but her bishops also, to exercise themselves faithfully in the Holy Scriptures, and to call upon God, by prayer, for the true understanding of the same. Not such is the dictate of common sense: for how, at the unripe age of admission into orders, can a stripling rightly understand those oracles of God, in the interpretation of which the wisest and most learned, at the close of a long, laborious life, have felt and confessed themselves to be as little children? Not such is the testimony of experience; for who have been the most exemplary, the most indefatigable of our parish priests? Who—but our Hookers, our Hammonds, our Pocockes, our Beveridges, and our Bulls? Men of whom it has been truly said, that their speculative knowledge, which gave light to the most dark and difficult subjects, was eclipsed by the more dazzling lustre of their practice; men who came forth from the recesses of their well-stored libraries, and from the devout retirement of their closets, like angels on missions of mercy, conveying light and love and consolation to the cottages of the poor, to the chambers of the aged and the decrepit, to the bed-sides of the sick and the dying, to the tender conscience, the wounded spirit, the broken and the contrite heart. Be these then our models: and we shall come to know and to rest assured, that the calling of a Christian minister, is not merely to work *much*, but to work *well*; not merely to exercise the body in a routine of outward services, but to come into the scene of action with a full mind and a purified heart: a mind stored with solid,

edifying knowledge, a heart purified through prayer and through the Word of God.

‘In our pastoral duties, then, we must be sustained by the fruits of studious application: in our studies we must be animated by the home-felt consciousness of striving, at least, to cure the souls entrusted to our charge. These two God hath joined together: and let no minister of God presume to put them asunder. In his pastoral visits, an ignorant clergyman can drag his inutility from house to house. In his learned researches, a careless parish minister can but offer incense to his own vanity and pride. The former is at best a most unprofitable servant, the latter, it must be feared, is a sacrilegious priest, who desecrates with strange fire the altar of our God.’

Again, Bishop Sanderson: ‘As the times now are, wherein learning aboundeth even unto wantonness, and wherein the world is full of questions, and controversies, and novelties, and niceties in religion; and wherein most of our gentry, very women and all, (by the advantage of a long peace and the customs of modern education, together with the help of a multitude of English books and translations,) are able to look through the ignorance of a clergyman, and censure it, if he be tripping in any point of history, cosmography, moral or natural philosophy, divinity, or the arts; yea, and to chastise his very method and phrase, if he speak loosely or impertinently, or but improperly, and if every thing be not pointwise—I say, as these times are, I would not have a clergyman content himself with every mediocrity of gifts, but by his prayers, care, and industry, improve those he hath, so as he may be able upon good occasion, to impart a spiritual gift to the people of God, whereby they may be established, and to speak with such understanding, and sufficiency, and pertinency, (especially when he hath just warning and a convenient time to prepare himself,) in some good measure of proportion to the quickness and ripeness of these present times, as they that love

not his coat may yet approve his labours.'—3d Sermon ad Clerum, p. 48, on 1 Cor. xii. 7.

Echard has an admirable passage on this point: 'Does he think that ignorance will outpreach learning? He is to remember that into want of learning I put also indiscretion and want of the use of learning, and also consideration of the capacity of the auditors; and there be many other things besides Greek and Latin hard words, and some mysterious points, which to preach to common people you had as good give them a lecture about squaring the circle. And therefore he did not hear me say, that the greatest mere scholar is always either the most admired preacher, or really does the most good, because many other circumstances are required upon which the fame and success of a preacher do sometimes depend. But yet thus far I durst venture to say, that he that understands the Holy Scriptures best, and therein the mind of God explained (under which I comprehend all learning requisite for the same); he also that has the command of true and useful rhetoric, discerning what words are most proper and intelligible, and how they are to be so ordered as they shall not make any harsh or unpleasant noise, nor be difficultly understood; and that has besides an audible and graceful voice, a comely and unblameable gesture: if this man, thus accomplished, be not more respected, and likely to do more good in general than he that wants all, or has but some few of these, then it is a most rash and idle thing to wish the very meanest we have of the clergy, to have had the opportunities of any better improvement.'—*Some Observations on the Answer*, &c. p. 19 (seventh edition, 1705).

The necessity of learning¹ for the ministry is no where more

¹ There is an argument which I do not altogether understand in a work, of many parts of which I could not speak in stronger terms of admiration than my feelings dictate, Dr. Chalmers' *Christian and Civic Economy of Great Towns*. I refer to Vol. i. ch. viii. It is unnecessary to say, that a

fully argued than by Bishop Bull, in that incomparable Sermon called ‘The Priest’s Office difficult and dangerous:’ it ought to be made a manual by the candidate for orders.

‘The first requisite to the office of a teacher, is a very large knowledge. The very name of his office implies this; he is διδασκάλος, *a teacher*, and he that is such must be as the Apostle requires, (1 Tim. iii. 2,) fit to teach. And this he cannot be unless he be well learned and instructed himself, and furnished with a plentiful measure of divine knowledge. God himself, by the prophet Malachi, (ch. iii. 7,) requires that the priest’s lips should keep and preserve knowledge. Methinks the expression is more emphatical than is ordinarily conceived; it seems to imply that the priest should be a kind of repository or treasury of knowledge, richly furnished with knowledge himself, and able also abundantly to furnish and supply the wants of those that shall at any time have recourse to him for instruction. And therefore it presently follows, “And they (*i. e.* the people)

man like Dr. Chalmers, so far from depreciating human learning, extols its advantages, and considers the high ground which Christianity holds in the *consideration*, at least, of the upper classes, as owing to the learning of the ministry. But in the chapter in question he is arguing on the advantages which the ministry may derive, in their peculiar duties, from lay assistants, and wishes to show that learning is not necessary to enable men to *teach* pure Christianity with great effect. His argument, which is stated with his usual eloquence, appears to me rather to prove that unlettered men are, or may be, fully qualified for *accepting* Christianity, a precious truth which I hold with as much earnestness as Dr. Chalmers. Dr. Chalmers shows very clearly (p. 310) that ‘all the forces which *mere humanity* can muster *may be* brought to teach Christianity in vain, and that then the Spirit of God may undertake the office of an enlightener, taking the Bible as his sole instrument; and that thus a workman of humble scholarship may be transformed, not into an erratic and fanciful enthusiast, but into a sound scriptural Christian, without one other religious tenet in his understanding than what is strictly and accurately defined by the literalities of the written word.’ This, however, surely does not prove that he would be an able teacher.

shall seek the law at his mouth." Yea! the words import that the priest should be a treasury of knowledge not to be exhausted.'

After showing, with great beauty, that our Lord himself expects the teacher to be like a householder, 'who, for the maintaining his family and the entertainment of his guests all the year round, is supposed to have an ἀποθήκη, or repository for provisions, and there to have laid in a great store and abundance of provisions of all sorts and kinds,' he goes on to say, that as all sciences perform the office of handmaids to theology, the art of arts, and science of sciences, as Nazianzen speaks, the complete divine ought to be master of all arts and sciences. 'But,' he adds, 'God be thanked this is only the heroic perfection, not the necessary qualification of a teacher. A man may very well content himself to sit in a much lower form, and sit safely; he may move in a far inferior orb, and yet give much light, and communicate a benign and useful influence to the Church of God. Let us view, therefore, the necessary parts of theology, wherein the teacher cannot be ignorant or uninstructed but to the very great detriment of his disciples, and his own greater shame and hazard. How ample a field have we still before us! here is theology positive, polemical, moral, casuistical, and all most necessary for the teacher. As to positive divinity, or the knowledge of those necessary speculative truths that are revealed in Scripture, a man can be no more a divine that is unacquainted with this, than he can be a grammarian that understands not the very first elements of grammar. And yet of so abstruse, so sublime a nature are even these truths, that for a man rightly to apprehend them, and clearly to explain them, especially to the capacity of his duller hearers, is no very easy matter.'

He then explains at great length the necessity of the three other parts mentioned, and adds, 'I have all this while spoken nothing of the Holy Scriptures, that deep and unsearchable mine

from whence the divine is to fetch all his treasures, from whence he is to borrow the principles of all theology, positive, polemical, moral, casuistical ; and therefore 'tis evident, that unless he be well studied in these he must needs be defective in all the rest ; he must needs be a weak divine that is not mighty in the Scriptures. And, Lord ! how many things are necessary to give a man a right understanding of these sacred writings ?—Rightly to understand the Scriptures is a very difficult thing, especially for us who live at so great a distance from those times wherein they were written, and those persons and churches to whom they were directed : 'tis no slender measure of the knowledge of antiquity, history, and philology, that is requisite to qualify a man for such an undertaking. They know nothing of the Holy Scriptures that know not this.'—Bull, *Some Points*, &c. i. 233—249.

The third of Jeremy Taylor's rules (given that 'the clergy, in their duty and their charges in the provision made for them may be more secure,') is—'It is necessary that you be very diligent in reading, laborious and assiduous in the studies of Scripture, not only lest ye be blind seers and blind guides, but because, without great skill and learning, ye cannot do your duty. A minister may as well sin by his ignorance as by his negligence, because when light springs from so many angles that may enlighten us, unless we look round about us, and be skilled in all the angles of reflection, we shall but turn our backs upon the sun, and see nothing but our own shadows.'—J. Taylor, *vi.* p. 519, 520.

'If by that which is generally first and requisite we measure what knowledge there should be in a minister of the Gospel of Christ, the arguments which the light of nature offereth, the laws and statutes which Scripture hath, the canons that are taken out of ancient synods, the decrees and constitutions of sincerest times, the sentences of all antiquity, and, in a word,

even every man's full consent and conscience, is against ignorance in them that have charge and cure of souls.'—Hooker, v. 81.

See the testimony of Bishop Jebb on this important subject, in the note on p. 116.

No. IX.

On the Necessity of a Confession of Faith¹.

IT is certain that no Church is *bound* by any direction in Scripture to compose a Confession of Faith, or require subscription to articles. It is bound only by Scripture, as well as by common sense, to see that its ministers speak the same thing, and that this 'same thing' should be the pure and everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ. But the external *means* of securing such unity in the truth seem certainly to be left to the discretion of man.—I am at a loss to imagine, indeed, what arguments can be alleged against this position. That for many ages all direct interposition has been withdrawn—that the religion of Jesus Christ is nevertheless to be carried on—that its furtherance is, consequently, left to human agency—that all human efforts will come to nothing, where there is no wisdom in devising means and no steadiness in using them—that Scripture has nevertheless not pointed out the means required for effecting this great purpose farther than the establishment of a ministry—and that the means, therefore, of preserving and spreading Christianity are to be devised as well as used by man, appear to be propositions admitting of no dispute. They are certainly propositions which in no way interfere with the firmest belief that it is to God, and

¹ From a 'Letter to the Lord Bishop of London,' by the author of this work. The same subject is most admirably treated by Jones of Nayland in the second chapter of his 'Remarks on the Confessional.'

not to man, that the preservation of the Christian religion must be owing ; that he alone can give to the best means blessing and success ; and that he will correct the use of improper and evil means by bringing failure and misery on them.

The point, then, for examination is, whether the use of strict and binding articles is an improper or a necessary means under the existing condition of the Church. When I say *strict and binding* articles, I would be understood to speak of articles which refer to essential matters only. The strongest objections may be made to articles¹ which, like the German, endeavour to ensure uniformity by laying down rules on very many and very minute points. I defend the use of articles which relate to fundamentals, and I defend the use of no other. Now if the ministry were to be consigned to a very few persons, and if it could be made certain that they would be the excellent of the earth alike for piety, for talents, and for learning, that they would be carefully brought up in the knowledge and profession of the true faith in Christ Jesus, under the watchful eye of the elder ministers and pastors of the flock, we might perhaps feel that such circumstances would almost exonerate the Church from the necessity of making any special provision as to this important matter. Error might perhaps enter into the heart of some one of these excellent men, because they would still be but men, but the means of correcting it would be at hand in the close and careful superintendence which is practicable in a small community, and in the piety and learning which would make him who erred still accessible to the voice of admonition and of truth.

In the actual Church of Christ, however, the case is and must be widely different in many important particulars. The extent and numbers of even a single national Church render it impossible that all its ministers should be of the highest order of endowments.

¹ State of the Protestant Religion, pp. 15 and 16.

A body so large as the ministry, be it of England, of France, or of Germany, must present the same diversity of gifts and graces, both of the intellect and the heart, as the world at large. It is obvious, too, that exactly in proportion to the number of the ministers, is the difficulty of any actual superintendence of their preaching by the higher order. These simple considerations entirely change the face of the case. It now becomes necessary to provide against the natural and unavoidable imperfections of the ministry, and to ensure the people, as far as human precautions can, against the errors which may arise from the treatment of the most important matters by men of ordinary gifts and capacities. Before men can teach, they must learn; before men can preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ, they must have some clear and commanding view of its nature. It is from Scripture, undoubtedly, that such a view must be gained; but will any one venture to say that from Scripture such a clear and commanding view as is necessary for a teacher can be easily gained by men of moderate capacities? Are the doctrines of Scripture, indeed, free from mystery? and do they relate to matters so entirely obvious that every teacher can fully decipher and easily comprehend them without aid and assistance? Is it quite certain that a body of men, the majority of whom, like the world at large, cannot be expected to possess more than moderate endowments, will all arrive at the same conclusions, and at that unity of view which I assume as necessary to the fulfilment of the purposes for which a Church is designed? Will it be contended that it shows any distrust of God's superintending care to suppose that they will not; to suppose that minds often not strong by nature, and always set afloat in an ocean of difficulties, at an age when every thing combines to mislead, will but too probably be blown about by every wind of doctrine? Is it, again, a sinful distrust of God, or a sinful doubt of the efficacy of his religion, to suppose that there is a spirit of pride working

in the hearts of too many of us, which prompts us to set up our own reason as our best guide, and to make it the supreme judge of the Revelation of God? Is it, in one word, a sinful distrust of God to say and believe, that man is a weak and imperfect being, that he requires to be constantly on his guard against his own imperfection, and to adopt every means which God has put in his power to remedy it?

But it will be asked, what evils will ensue, even if all do not gain this clear view, and do not arrive at an entire unity of opinion? Without entering on that question at large, it is sufficient to reply, that it is not the business of the ministers of religion to live for ever in the cell or the cloister. When, indeed, I remember that they are to go abroad into the world, and to be entrusted with the happiness and repose of their flocks, with the care of hundreds and thousands of immortal souls, I do not think I can raise my estimate of the evil which may be thus done too high. What, if men persuade themselves, like the Germans, that the Rationalist scheme is the only true one, and thus rob their poor hearers of all the privileges and blessings of their high calling? What, if some make only as near an approach to these doctrines as the cold tenets of the modern Socinians, and reduce Christianity to a better system of morals, with the certainty of a future life? Can we think, without the deepest compassion, of the poor flock thus led astray into 'dry grounds, where no water is,' robbed of the conviction of an atonement for sin, of justification by faith, of the intercession of an ever-living Redeemer, and of all the blessings of a communion with the Holy Spirit? Can we think, without indignation, of a Church entrusted with the care of souls, which might prevent these evils, and yet allows them? But it is contended that it is wrong and sinful to think that God will not protect his own religion, and to believe that such evils must happen to the whole or greater part of the Church, unless human safeguards prevent them.

Now I certainly never have asserted, and do not now assert, that such evils *must* arise. I do not pretend to be able to foresee with certainty the effects of human errors, nor the operations of God's providence. It is sufficient to know that such evils *may* arise; and when I remember that Rationalism has lately been confessedly predominant¹ in the German Protestant Churches, I am sure I cannot be contradicted, if I say, *may probably* arise. I use the word under a deep sense of the imperfection and perverseness which perpetually lead us to abuse God's best blessings to our own misery and ruin, and under a conviction which I cannot resist, that we are here below under a course of moral discipline, and taught only by the painful lessons of experience, to avoid to-morrow the evils for which we dearly suffer to-day.

That conviction makes me feel it as unreasonable to expect that God will interfere to give immediately those warnings which, by the wise arrangements of his Providence, will be given by the ordinary course of things, or to prevent those evils against which he has already placed sufficient protection in our own hands, as it would be to wonder at God's permission of evil from man's wilfulness under the other departments of his moral government. It is vain to reply that God will take care of his Church, vain to suppose that if we neglect or misuse the means, the instruments, and the opportunities which he puts into our hands for an especial purpose, that he will bestow the same

¹ How can they who think that the use of confessions of faith shows a distrust of God's care of his Church, admit that *any* error or mismanagement of man can bring Christianity into such a state as it has been in Germany? If I have 'derogated from the independence and inherent power of the word of God,' by admitting the supposition that Christianity is likely to receive temporary injury from the neglect of precautions, do they do that independence and inherent power less wrong in supposing that injury will follow from the over-use of such precautions?

blessings or effect the purpose in the same way, as if we used them with thankfulness and diligence. What should we say of the husbandman, who neither ploughed nor sowed, because God alone could give to every seed its own body, and because he would do so if he intended man to live by bread? What should we say, then, of the spiritual husbandman, who thinks it wrong to take any measures for the preservation of Christianity, because God alone can and will preserve it, or who thinks that the use of such measures derogates from the independence and inherent power of the word of God? No, God has indeed promised that his religion shall be as eternal as its Author, but he has promised nothing more, and from the evils which, eternal as it is, it has suffered, and is suffering, we must surely learn the lesson, that he never intended us to expect from him that which he has given us the power to effect ourselves.

But if it be allowed that some measures on our part are necessary, it may still be objected that Articles and Confessions are not the best. I am not so rash as to assert that they are; but I must confess that, under the guidance of a true form of Church discipline, they seem to be very far the best, of which we have as yet any knowledge or experience. That a good and careful education of the clergy under really pious and really learned men would, even in the present wide extension of the Church of Christ, do something, I am well persuaded; but, for the reasons I have already assigned, I do not think it would be enough to ensure the safety of the people against the chance of erroneous doctrines, when I remember how liable even the wisest men are by themselves to err and be misled. Neither do I assert, on the other hand, that no evils are likely to arise from the use of strict articles. I am inclined to regard every human institution as imperfect: but I consider, too, that its wisdom is sufficiently vindicated if it can be shown that the evils which it is likely to produce are, in a rational view, less, and the benefits

greater, than any other system offers. This I believe to be entirely true of subscription to articles ; and I know of few cases where the actual evils have been more grossly exaggerated, and the actual benefits more strangely overlooked.

The benefits, the enormous benefits, are these, that there is an unity of doctrine, that there is no opposition of preachers, and that the flocks who look up to them for light are not thrown first into doubt and difficulty, and finally into indifference or into despair, by observing such an opposition, by finding that a fresh minister condemns and rejects that doctrine which they have been taught in their youth, which has been the comfort of their manhood, and in which they have seen their fathers die. These are great benefits ; and another is this, that when a congregation of faithful, holy, and learned men have, in the spirit of piety and of prayer, carefully examined Scripture itself, have recurred to the records of the Primitive Church, and have laid down a rule of faith, such as they find in Scripture, such as the Primitive Church and the good and wise of all ages have derived from Scripture, men have every assurance which they can have, short of a fresh Revelation, that they now possess a right and true view of the present system. The learning of an individual, nay, the united learning and genius of an age, can do nothing to overturn this accumulated testimony of the learned and the pious of many ages and generations. Man is no higher in the scale of intellect than he was eighteen centuries ago, though he may have shaken off some idle fancies, and have been taught by a wider experience that some favourite notions were errors or prejudices. These, however, were mere clouds in the distant horizon, which never approached and never obscured the mid-day sun. But if man has no fresh powers of mind granted to him in these days for grappling with the great subjects of Christian Theology ; neither can it be said that the powers which he has were not employed in former ages in considering them. These subjects

are not the subjects of one period or one state of society, but of all ; these subjects, from the first hour the Christian Revelation was made, have never ceased to exercise the hopes and thoughts of the great and the good ; they are not now brought to light, after having slumbered through ages, disregarded or forgotten. We cannot, surely, be absurd enough to imagine, that any new light will break upon us as to essentials. What is the meaning, then, of this perpetual longing for the right of alteration and improvement in that which, if these views be true, cannot possibly be susceptible of either the one or the other ¹ ? We may, indeed, propound what has never been propounded before ; but we may rest assured, that every view short of absolute absurdity suggested itself to the minds of great and learned men in former days, and that every view which has been rejected was rejected because their wide views, their learning, and their love taught them it was not Christian truth. Some man may perhaps object that God may, for some wise purpose, have allowed us for eighteen centuries to deceive ourselves. In this case, it is only folly to dispute about Churches, or Articles, or Creeds, or Christianity itself. There is nothing to dispute about—there is a mere chaos before us, in which our eyes have shown themselves unable to discern light from darkness. But unless this is so, if indeed God has given us a Revelation and the aid of his Spirit to understand it, it is so certain that nothing which concerns

¹ Hear what Waterland says. ‘ Reformation is good when reformation is wanting, but to be always reforming, is no reforming at all ; it is behaving like children, tossed to and fro with every wind of doctrine. All errors of any moment have been purged off long ago by the care of our Reformers, and why are we then still reforming ? Physic may be proper at certain seasons, but to pretend to live constantly upon it, instead of food, is the certain way to impair, and in a little time to destroy, the best and soundest constitution in the world.’—Remarks on Dr. Clarke’s Exposition, &c. (Works, Vol. v. p. 436.)

man can be more certain, that those great doctrines which the Primitive Church thought she derived from the Founder of Christianity and his apostles, which have been accepted and taught by Chrysostom, Augustine, Luther, Bossuet, Bull, or Waterland, are the genuine and essential doctrines of the Gospel; and that those points in relation to the free will of man, on which such men have differed, must for ever remain a mystery, till it shall please God either to give us a new Revelation here, or to exalt us to a state of higher knowledge. It is vain, idle, and presumptuous for one of us to imagine, that we shall discover some hidden sense of Scripture on *essential* points, or some great truths which have escaped them. These men pursued the knowledge of the truth, not with an ignorant fanaticism, nor with a presumptuous confidence in their own learning, but with an humble spirit of prayer, which, while it assiduously cultivated all the natural gifts of the intellect, and used all the means which a gracious God presented to it in the ordinary course of nature, yet relied on the instruction of that Providence for a knowledge of the truth. They would willingly confess that much might yet be done for the illustration of Scripture, and by a diligent study of it to clear doctrinal and enforce moral truths. They would own that they might have misinterpreted some texts, and collected from them a confirmation of particular doctrines, which they were not intended to give; but the supposition that they erred in the *sum* of Christian doctrine, and that the great doctrines on which they built their hopes now and hereafter, might be merely the creatures of their fancy, they would have considered as a supposition fraught, as in sooth it is, with ingratitude and distrust of God.

Considerations like these, I must honestly own, appear to me to elevate the establishment of a confession of faith into almost the rank of an indispensable duty in every Church. If such blessings as these, Unity I mean, and Truth, as far as man can

judge, seem likely, under God's blessing, to follow the use of these means, we cannot be excused for neglecting them. It is a crying injustice that, because we hold this belief, and think that the Spirit of God will be pleased to use this among other means of leading His Church and people to truth, our adversaries should accuse us of thinking that this or any other means can supersede the need of God's guiding and directing Spirit, and should charge us 'with trusting more in the human formula than in the Spirit of Christ.' We assert as earnestly as the strongest advocate for freedom can, that 'that Church is, indeed, in a lamentable state, which, beside the legal fences against error, dares not believe in a source from which the truth issues in a living stream.' Before we are supposed to doubt the proposition, before such heavy accusations are brought against us, it were much to be wished that our opponents would demonstrate the inconsistency of believing that 'legal fences against error' are expedient, and yet that there is an eternal and living source of truth.

I proceed to consider what are the evils likely to arise from the use of Articles. Let it be observed, again, that I never have denied, that I do not now deny, that evils may arise from the use of them, as well as from every other human institution. I only contend that those evils are exceedingly exaggerated, and that they do not deserve a moment's thought when compared with the blessings which they accompany. The first and chief of these evils is, that 'the human mind can take no step except in the leading-strings of authority,' that it is accustomed 'to derive its Christian knowledge from the mechanical study of the letter of a confused form,' that, in short, the use of Articles tends to repress all freedom of inquiry, and to make men exalt a human system above Scripture, or at any rate to the same level.

The fear of these evils is a phantom that haunts some men's imagination like some fearful vision. They seem to see this, and

this only, before them; they seem to have no dread of any other evil; and, in my judgment at least, they denounce it with no inconsiderable degree of injustice. The 'gains,' they say, arising from that horrid state of unbelief which they allow has existed in the German Churches, 'are in part obvious; the banishment of a reliance on the mere letter of a received system, of a mere intellectual conception of Christianity, of a deadening formularism, of the undervaluing of Scripture in behalf of an over-reformed human system, of an uncharitable polemic,' &c. &c. They seem, in fact, to believe, that nothing can arise from this reliance on a human system, but cold, heartless controversialists, perfectly careless about Christianity itself. They denounce very loudly what they call mere traditionary belief¹, and think it less hopeful than even decided infidelity.

I must begin, then, by remarking, that a very invidious use of the phrase *human systems*² is constantly made by our opponents. The simple truth is, that they who object to what they call human systems, must, if they are consistent, disapprove of the use of Confessions and Articles altogether. For no Church has set up the Platonic, or Aristotelian, or any other system of philosophy in opposition to the doctrine of Scripture, nor has any Protestant

¹ I confess that to me all these views appear to be founded on a narrow view of human nature. If, indeed, a man has the power and the learning to examine for himself, refuses to do so, and takes up any system with a resolution to defend it at all events, he is certainly no Christian, nor even an honest man. But how many pious and humble Christians are there who have never felt the wish nor the power to examine! Am I to be told that there is so little efficacy in the great doctrines of the Gospel, that they will not produce a Christian spirit and a Christian life in one who has been taught them in his youth, and has never doubted? They who contend so strongly for inquiry are not feelingly alive to the condition of this large portion of the Christian world.

² I cannot repeat too often, that I am not defending the German Confessions.

Church gone farther than saying that to the word and testimony we must look for the truth, that all truth is to be found in the word of God, and that the word of God lays down such and such propositions. These Churches exhort and command *all* their members and ministers to search the Scriptures constantly and diligently, and to look to them as the source of all truth. Can it really be intended to argue that they do wrong in endeavouring to make that search a profitable one, and that because the study of Scripture is difficult, and mankind liable to be misled, the Church is bound to give them no aid towards finding the truth? Yet this is the object of the Confessions of Protestant Churches. They present a view or summary of Scripture; and they neither do, nor pretend to do, any thing more. Is it a human system which teaches us that there is a Trinity of Persons in the Godhead; that Christ was God and man; that we are redeemed by His blood; that our nature is corrupt; that we cannot save ourselves; that our justification is by faith only? If this is, indeed, a human system, it must be remembered that the individual who studies Scripture in the most pious spirit, whenever he makes up his mind on any particular doctrine of Scripture, sets up a human system also. If such fearful evils, as are alleged, are likely to arise from accepting a system devised by others, can we expect to avoid them by resting on a system which is the result of our own examination? The existence of any system, that is, of any positive view of Scripture, is the fancied error, which they who contend against human systems ought, if they are consistent, to deprecate. The evils must, I should imagine, be in proportion to the pertinacity with which the system is maintained. Now the theory or system which we arrive at ourselves, is precisely that which we maintain the most stiffly; and it must, therefore, according to these principles, be productive of even more 'dead and contented orthodoxy' in the end, than the acceptance of Church Articles.

Besides which, such a system is infinitely more liable to error than any Church system, because at best it is the fruit of the inquiry of one pious and learned man, while the Church system has received the assent of thousands as learned, as pious, and as anxious to know the truth as himself¹. I confess I rather wonder at than admire the student who resolves to abide by his own views, whatever they may be, because he is satisfied that he has taken the right way of getting at the truth, and that God will not allow him to err, but has no difficulty in believing that God may have allowed his whole Church to err for eighteen hundred years, or that none before himself have sought for light and knowledge in a right spirit.

I trust that considerations like these will do away with the

¹ It will be said that, according to my principles, all Churches must be in possession of the truth, and yet they differ. But a very little attention will clear this difficulty. We shall find that all Churches agree, as far as they have adopted Scripture for their guide on the one hand, and have not on the other violated any of the obvious dictates of common sense and common sincerity. In the Roman Church, for example, the great truths of the Trinity and Atonement are received. Thus the Romanists have been led into truth on these points when they looked to Scripture alone: but they set up another guide—Tradition, and to that source we may trace far the larger share of their errors. Then, as to the various Protestant Churches, we can show at once why there is difference, and consequently error. The foreign Protestants have confessed their regret at being obliged, as they thought they were, to depart from the old discipline of the Church. If men will give up such important truths, they always, I doubt not, suffer in dissent and distraction, for their error and want of resolution. Again, they chose to make their confessions too minute, to define every thing, and in a total ignorance of human nature, to decide on difficulties which are not difficulties of Christianity, but of the human mind, as, for example, on predestination. Whenever, then, any Church has endeavoured to follow Scripture, has acted up to what it knew to be right, and has attended to the dictates of common sense, in not deciding on matters incapable of decision either from Revelation or reason, it has been led into truth. If it has violated these plain principles it has erred; and what else could be expected?

prejudice which the use of such a phrase as human systems cannot fail to introduce into this question ; and that it will be understood that the Church does not intend to bring forward any system but the system of Scripture, nor any view of her own, but simply a summary of Scripture ; those truths, in short, which the best, the most learned, and the most pious Christians from the beginning till now have found in Scripture, when they have studied it with all the helps which they could derive from Divine aid and human learning. That differences have arisen, on points either of minor importance, or incapable of decision, is true—that different views, different summaries have been presented, is true. But the observations I have made are not the less important. It is one thing to present a system of our own, and another to present a system which we conscientiously (though it may be erroneously) believe to be the word of Scripture. In the first case we rely on human reason and human authority to the exclusion of the word of God ; in the other, though we may misunderstand that word, we still reserve our reverence for it, still bow to what we believe to be its dictates, still acknowledge, in humility and sincerity, that no human system can be admitted by those who have received the word of God.

But I am quite prepared to meet the question fully and fairly. Let it be allowed that in narrow minds some degree of prejudice may be excited by adherence to a public confession. I contend that from such minds prejudice, in some shape, can never be banished ; that if it be expelled in this form, it will return, as I shall show, in one far more mischievous, with the additional evil of a conflict and opposition of opinions in the Church. I say, therefore, that for a large part of mankind, and consequently for no small part of the clergy, it is better that they should be taught by some public authority what they are to believe, while for the others the use of Articles will never suppress nor even check the full exercise of inquiry.

It is not to be denied, as I have already said, that the large mass of mankind is endowed with only moderate abilities, and is, therefore, unfit to conduct abstruse and difficult researches ; and the same observation must, in some degree, apply to a large body of the Clergy, though they will always maintain a certain superiority over their equals in station and opportunities. Now, although the right of inquiry is claimed and allowed by all good Protestants, yet the existence and the constant exercise of the right are, I think, very different matters. I am, indeed, firmly convinced, that it is our highest duty, as well as highest privilege, not only to try the views presented to us by the test of Scripture with the utmost care before we subscribe to them, but if we subsequently become dissatisfied with the view presented to us, to have recourse again to fair and full examination. But if, in a pious and constant use of Scripture, we perceive no difference in doctrine from that view which we have been taught to consider as the true view of Scripture doctrine, nay, if we feel it strengthened and confirmed, I am at a loss to understand why we should feel it a duty to reject it, merely because it has been *taught* us (on grounds, too, which we have really every reason for believing to be just grounds), and to reconstruct this, or construct some other for ourselves. I am still more at a loss to know why this should be considered as a duty, if we have no peculiar talents for conducting such an investigation, or why we should not look on Church authority as one of the means used by God's Providence for bringing his people to a knowledge of the truth.

Proud, as we too often are, of powers which cannot justify pride, no doubt it is an easy task to set all men inquiring ; but what will be the result ? A very limited knowledge of human nature will, I think, explain it. Men of moderate abilities soon become conscious themselves of the inability they will not confess to others—they become perplexed and weary with investigations

for which they have no taste and no ability; and the final and only use which they make of the liberty they claim, is to choose some guide and leader for themselves, and as the easiest way out of the labyrinth into which they have fallen, to adhere to his view and his system with a dogged pertinacity. Let any one who will view this matter with an unprejudiced eye, say whether in the overwhelming majority of cases, emancipation from public authority is not synonymous with 'swearing on the words' of some favourite teacher; and whether all we know of the construction of the common order of minds does not lead us to suppose that this is the probable, I might say, the necessary, as well as the actual result? And if it be so, is it a desirable result? If the heart, having proudly asserted its own liberty, must at last become sensible of its own weakness, and under the influence of that weakness seek for a guide; is it better that that guide should be some self-appointed one, some teacher, it may be, of great abilities and great learning, but who has devised, on his own authority and responsibility, some novel views of Scripture, or that the guide should be the collected wisdom of the wise, the learned, and the pious of many ages and generations?

If these views be just, it is quite certain that the evil which the liberal party deprecates (the obstinate adherence, I mean, to a human system) will exist on their own plan, and to a greater degree than under the use of a public confession, while there will be the additional and tremendous evils of a variety of systems, of a total want of unity, of open and probably of violent opposition in the Church. If any doubt could be entertained on this matter before, the experience of Germany, for the last forty or fifty years, would entirely satisfy any impartial inquirer on this head. Few histories, perhaps, would afford more instances of ready acceptance of absurdities, and of obstinate adherence to them. Any thing more narrow, more bigoted, and more violent in defence of their peculiar opinions, and more uncharitable to

their opponents, than the larger portion of the Rationalist writers, I may defy the history of the Church in any age to produce. After the experience which that history affords, I confess, therefore, I marvel not a little at such confident anticipations of speedy good, in a *spontaneous* return to all that is sound in faith and doctrine, as some persons seem to entertain, and at their earnest deprecation of the exercise of any authority whatever over the German Clergy. Whatever may be the future powers and abilities of man, Church history, I think, shows pretty clearly that control, and advice, and guidance are still necessary to his well-being. It appears to me, at least, a little hasty to be so confident of recovery, when only the vehemence of the attack is over, and many fearful symptoms are still discoverable; and a little rash to be so very careless about leaving the razors or the pistols within reach, because the fit of delirium is just over.

I proceed to consider the case of those who are both able and willing to inquire. The question is, whether their desire for a full investigation of the truth will be repressed by the existence and use of Articles? I contend that it will not, but that on the contrary such inquirers will be at once encouraged, and most successfully conducted, under the operation of symbolical writings. Let it be remembered, in the first place, that subscription is never intended to prevent inquiry. When I take the prescribed oath, I declare my *present* belief—I cannot take the oath as to my future belief, for I cannot declare what I do not know. The obligations which subscription imposes are binding on me till I publicly retract my subscription; but there is nothing in the subscription, nor in the mind of the Church which imposes it, to prevent me from retracting my subscription at a subsequent period. There is consequently nothing in it to prevent me from discharging that duty which I owe to God, to the Church, and to myself, by being much in the reading of Scripture, and ready

to embrace that which due examination, conducted on right principles, and by the aid of sound learning, shall declare to be its meaning. I will not, indeed, affect to say, though I fear my character as a Protestant will suffer for such an opinion in some quarters, that I think it a very wise or desirable habit of mind, to study Scripture only for the sake of finding that I am and ever have been wrong. I would study Scripture (my ordination oath binds me to do so) in the earnest desire to know it more fully and perfectly; and if that knowledge should lead me to a conviction that my earlier views were wrong, I trust I should act such a part as my conscience dictates, a matter to which I shall presently come. If, then, in the act of subscription there is nothing which *formally* prevents inquiry, is there any thing which has in fact that tendency? I say again, that it encourages such inquiry. I cannot state my belief in this matter better than in the words of a German Protestant, now resident in France, Philip Stapfer¹. 'Far,' says he, 'from doing prejudice to the progress of theology, and preventing its gradual perfection, symbolical books lead directly to a development of this science, and constantly invite us to a new examination of its foundations. Checks are not fetters; they often act the part of a stimulant, and by directing our inquiries to a determinate end, prevent them from becoming vague, and remaining without any definite result. The human mind, in order to exercise its strength and gain a knowledge of the truth, requires a point of departure, a positive theme, an object of comparison with its ideas, which may be ever present, and may have weight from a value of opinion, or from its importance to society. The history of

¹ Archives du Christianisme, for October, 1824. The whole of the earlier part of this article is quite admirable; but I differ from Stapfer in the line of conduct he recommends to those who doubt on what he considers minor points.

science abounds in examples of the salutary effects of a text which, so to speak, controls thought, which compels it to concentrate itself, and prevents it from losing itself in uncertain and disorderly efforts. It was by positive systems of legislation, by the Pandects, that the Cujaciuses, the Domats, and even Montesquieu was formed. It may be said that the Bible offers us this check—this food for the inquiring spirit—this first matter of investigation—this means of intellectual control, the efficacy of which we extol; and that it is to the study of the Bible that we owe the superiority of high speculation which characterises the philosophers of modern times, and the works which have created, increased, and consolidated the edifice of human knowledge in all the divisions of *morals* and *theology*. We do not deny this efficacy of the documents of Revelation; it was in that school, undoubtedly, that the great faculties of St. Augustin, of Calvin, of Bacon, of Grotius, of Pascal, of Bossuet, of Leibnitz, fortified, developed, and ennobled themselves, and that their genius learned to know and to improve itself. But it was by attaching themselves to a particular system, as a summary of our sacred books, consecrated by the meditation of their predecessors, or by the belief of some branch of the Christian family, that they found the opportunity and the means of knowing all the extent of their forces, and of applying them to the culture of the moral sciences, and to the advancement of religion. The examination, the attack, and the defence of these summaries of Christian doctrine, have given to the study of Scripture all the development to which the progress of theology is due. Without such summaries as confessions of faith of some extent, how could the friends of this great and rich science ever find their way in the labyrinth of diverging opinions among the interpreters of Scripture, or direct to any good purpose their researches towards what still remains to discover or correct? The abrogation of formulas is certainly not the way to amelioration; on the

contrary (and here experience comes to the support of reason) it is the means of stopping all progress, of wasting our resources, and paralysing all our efforts by the instability of their direction.'

These reasonings appear to me so conclusive, that nothing need be added to them. We may proceed, therefore, to the discussion of the other objections which are made to the use of Articles. One of the great propositions of the advocates for Ultra-Protestantism is, that the Church is not to bind its hands by the resolution never to deviate from the letter of the faith of its earlier state; and I have been reproached severely for thinking, as it has been stated that I do, that the Church will *necessarily* decline unless it does so. It is maintained, not only by the German Divines, but by very many among ourselves, that the Church ought always to have and to exercise the power of correcting and ameliorating its belief as often as any new views require it; nay, this is thought the essence of Protestantism, this power of change and correction is deemed the atmosphere in which alone Protestantism can exist, and without which she expires or changes her nature. I cannot but think, that this argument is one of those traps which our restless ingenuity and perverseness devise for our own annoyance, one of those many methods by which we contrive to throw away our happiness, and almost our existence, from a childish fear of dangers that can never arrive. Let us state the matter clearly. If it is meant that a Church which sets out with laying down a rule of faith on all points, however numerous or however minute, is not to bind itself to an adherence to such a rule, I have this to answer again and again, that I do not defend the proceedings of such a Church in any way. It has begun by a grievous error, fatal to the peace of its members and to its own. A rule of faith laid down by any Church conducted on rational principles, must embrace *fundamentals only*; and the question I am about to consider relates

to such a Church and such a rule of faith alone. I am not concerned to defend or argue about any other, but cheerfully give it up to the censure of the Ultra-Protestants. I am now about to inquire how far a Church, which has adopted a rule of faith of a rational kind, is to bind itself to an adherence to that rule.

Now, if the Ultra-Protestants put their assertion into plainer words, it would, I apprehend, amount to this and this only, that if the Church found her present doctrines to be false, she must not any longer assert them to be true; that if she found that they contradict what may appear to her hereafter the clear sense of Scripture, she must not any longer assert that they express that sense. Do these gentlemen really imagine, that any one in possession of common honesty or common understanding will gainsay this? No, if the Trinity is *proved* to be an absurdity, and the Atonement a falsehood—if it is *proved* that Jesus was a mere man, and that there is no Holy Spirit—nay, farther, if it is proved that the Scriptures are forgeries, and that there is no God in heaven, let us renounce these doctrines. No honest man, I apprehend, ever assents to any doctrines but because he feels that there is sufficient ground for believing them to be true; no honest man will maintain them after he has sufficient ground to believe that they are false; and the rule to be pursued by one honest man is to be pursued by that ‘congregation of faithful men’ which compose the visible Church. All this is willingly admitted; nor am I at all aware how the establishment of a confession of faith can interfere with it. When it becomes a matter of general conviction that the existing rule of faith is false, it will undoubtedly be changed. This would be admitted as willingly by every honest adherent of the Church of Rome. How decidedly soever the Romanist may assert, for example, the infallibility of the Church, he will tell you, with the most perfect sincerity, that he will renounce the doctrine as soon as you can disprove it. In this sense, therefore, I certainly do

not wish the Church to 'bind her hands,' nor to impose any doctrine after she ceases to believe it true. So much for theory ; but if we look at the question *practically*, do all these admissions mean any thing ? Will the Church ever change her doctrines ? Are we to expect some new views of Christianity which have escaped all former ages ? We are not arguing the case, be it again said, of the German Church, or of any other Church which has faulty symbolical books ; faulty, I mean, in deciding on too many and too trifling points, and thus hazarding the happiness of individuals and her own peace. On this subject there is and can be no argument. The question is, whether a Church which lays down a rule of faith only on points universally confessed to be fundamentals, will change that rule ; or, in plainer words, whether a Church which has got rid of all superfluous articles, which holds only what is essential to Christianity as at present understood, is to look forward to, and to provide for, an entire abrogation of the present system of Christian doctrine ; whether it is to believe that for eighteen centuries the great mass of the Christian Church has been labouring under a delusion, in accepting what are now considered as fundamental doctrines ? To say that these doctrines are *certainly* the doctrines of Scripture, is indeed saying what we are not theoretically justified in saying, because nothing in which humanity is concerned is certain. We may be mistaken on every point on which we may form an opinion ; and it is our duty to be painfully alive to our own weakness and liability to mistake ; but it is a folly and not a duty to believe that we may not arrive at a moral certainty and conviction of any truths, and that God did not intend us to act upon such conviction. But if this be so, it is obvious that if the exercise of the subtlest wits, the researches of the most extensive learning, the voice of all ages and of all countries cannot give us such a certainty, nothing can. I must, therefore, at whatever hazard, avow my belief that

while Christianity lasts, our Church cannot change her opinions. Nor am I apprehensive, when I remember what latitude of discussion her Articles allow, that any evil will arise—that any of those who are capable of inquiry will be precluded from it by our Articles, nor that they will drive any one who is capable of taking a wide view to a narrow one.

The only question remaining for consideration is, whether the use of Articles is likely to cause hypocrisy and dissimulation in individuals who, for the sake of temporal advantages, may either profess or continue in the profession of doctrines which they disbelieve. In the first place, it seems obvious that this evil, supposing it to exist, does not arise exclusively from the use of Articles. If any form of belief be professed, whether Christianity or Paganism, something like adherence to it in its ministers must be aimed at, though it may not be secured by Articles. It can make no difference in what way the object is gained; its existence is the cause which gives rise to hypocrisy. But the evil may be looked at in two ways. If the mischief likely to arise to the Church from the introduction of hypocrites is regarded, I can only say that I know of no sovereign cure for dishonesty. There will always be found, while this state of things lasts, some base men whom no ties of conscience can restrain. If the widest range were given to opinions within the pale of Christianity, still there would be some men who would falsely assume the mask of Christianity for their own purposes. It is an evil undoubtedly, but an evil for which there is no remedy. But it may be said also, that Articles are a snare to tender consciences, or that men will either abstain from inquiry, or endeavour to suppress their conviction, from interested motives. I see no symptoms of any tenderness of conscience in such a state of things; nor does this case appear to me to differ very widely from the rest. There is a plain rule of right in this matter, as well as every other, and if men

will not observe it, they are not to ascribe their situation to faults which arise from their weak or evil principles. Let no man subscribe without the strictest inquiry; let him continue, as he is bound to do by every tie, to be much in the study of Scripture; and let him, if that study shall lead him to doubt the correctness of any of those doctrines to which he has subscribed, again examine fully and fearlessly. If the result of his examination confirm his doubts, let him remember that there is but one course for him to pursue—that it is a matter of common honesty—and that there is as little doubt as to the necessity of pursuing that course, as there would be about the propriety of taking or retaining what belongs to another. A pause, however, and a delay are not only justifiable, but are a solemn duty; for the step which he is about to take, in publicly renouncing his faith, will undoubtedly affect others as well as himself. He is bound, therefore, to ascertain that his change of opinion is not a passing one; that it rests upon grounds which, after due time have been allowed, still appear satisfactory; that he has given due weight to the authority of the Church; in a word, that he has not determined rashly, hastily, or in an undue degree of veneration for his own opinion. When all this is ascertained, he has but one course, I repeat, as an honest man, to pursue. He must resign the situation, to which he was appointed in consequence of his holding opinions which he holds no longer. If he will not do this, if he will not pursue the dictates of common honesty, I really know no cure for his want of principle; for the fault is clearly in the individual and not in the system.

THE following Notes were omitted in their proper places :

On the direct recognition of the Episcopal form of Government by the Church, see Canons vi. & vii.

On the Testimony of the Calvinists in favour of Episcopacy, see Leslie's Works, ii. 755.

On Jerome's Testimony, see Bishop Stillingfleet's Primary Charge.

On the intention of the Apostles that the Commission should be permanent, see Jones of Nayland's Works, Vol. ii. p. 47, and Bishop Overall's Convocation Book, p. 180.

On the question whether Personal Holiness is necessary to make the Ministrations of the Clergy *effectual*, see Leslie's Works, ii. p. 735, and Bishop Brownrig, Vol. ii. p. 401, 2.

THE END.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.





